

**COMMUNIST-SOCIALIST
PROPAGANDA IN
AMERICAN SCHOOLS**

VERNE P. KAUB

the
university of
connecticut
libraries

hbl, stx

LA 209.2.K3

Communist-socialist propaganda in



3 9153 00617605 3

LA/209/.2/K3

COMMUNIST-SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS

By

VERNE P(AUL) KAUB

A documented study of the role National Education Association is taking in the indoctrination of the youth of our country with the ideology of Communism-Socialism.

FOURTH PRINTING 1958



MEADOR PUBLISHING COMPANY
324 NEWBURY STREET
BOSTON 15, MASSACHUSETTS

COPYRIGHT, 1953, BY EDWARD K. MEADOR

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NO. 53-10105

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE MEADOR PRESS, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

DEDICATION

To all my teachers —

Those noble Christian men and women who, during the years of the decades spanning the turn of the century, strove mightily to guide a reluctant scholar into the paths of learning; and, by precept and example, pointed the way to an upright Christian life, this little book is respectfully and lovingly dedicated. Not once did any one of them hint to me or my classmates that it is silly to believe in spiritual things because science has wiped out all reason to believe in any such foolish notions. Never from one of them did I get as much as a tiny suggestion that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are sham documents, craftily drafted to cement the power of wealth over the poor and downtrodden of the nation. All these teachers have removed to places unknown to me, or, as is more likely in the case of the majority, have gone to their rewards. But they live on, in my heart.

By the Same Author
Collectivism Challenges Christianity
1946

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Introduction—Wheels Within Wheels | 7 |
| I Following the Communist-Socialist Line | 17 |
| II Using Communist-Socialist Techniques | 29 |
| III Broadening Propaganda Field | 49 |
| IV “Building America” | 63 |
| V Progressive Education “Exposes” Prop- aganda | 83 |
| VI Preoccupation with Democracy | 96 |
| VII Fostering Materialistic Educational Pol- icies | 117 |
| VIII Promoting International Collectivism | 131 |
| IX John Dewey’s Philosophy “In a Nutshell” | 146 |
| X An Over-All View of NEA | 157 |
| Index | 183 |

INTRODUCTION

WHEELS WITHIN WHEELS

Thucydides, Greek historian who lived twenty-four centuries ago, observed that history repeats. All down through the centuries men have pondered this saying and repeated it so often that it may be called a cliché. Few have dared to disagree; millions have agreed, and lauded the wisdom of the man who first made the statement.

The National Council of Education was one of the more important "wheels within wheels"* that went to make up that vast, complicated machine which is the National Education Association. NCE was organized in 1880, growing out of a paper read by Thomas W. Bicknell before the Department of Superintendence of NEA. In the intervening years, until dissolution in 1948, NCE was a powerful factor in determining the policies and programs of NEA.

When the Department of Superintendence was in session in Cleveland, O., in February, 1934, Willard E. Givens, then superintendent of schools at Oakland, California, brought in the report of the fourth of seven "topic groups," which he served as chairman. The group's report, "Education for the New America," Chairman Givens declared, "comes directly from the thinking of more than one thousand members of the department." Here are excerpts from the report, which seems to have set the pattern for the policies

*Ezekiel 1:16, about 595 B. C.

and programs of NEA since that time:

In this critical transition period, great issues confront us, especially the issue of building an economy of plenty for all. . . . engineers assure us that the production system cannot be kept going unless we distribute a very large amount of purchasing power to all of the people. . . .

But to achieve these things, many drastic changes must be made. A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control. A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence, they will join in creating a swift nationwide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interest of all the people.

. . .
Moreover, this kind of adult education is necessary if we are to take the next educational step, namely, the building of a great program of studies for the schools of the new America. One central core of that program will be a new social science which will be built directly from the factors and problems of our contemporary society; . . .

Corresponding changes must be made in the life that the young people will live in the school. The whole competitive regime and its scheme of rank-order marks and promotions will have to be replaced by a program of coöperation and self-cultivation. . . .

In a planned economy we may expect improvement of education by reason of: (a) Continuous

improvement within the social order whereby education shall have available better mores to transmit; (b) by the operation of a planning organization or agency, which may consider a new and better social framework within which society may operate; and (c) the functioning of the school as an agency in the work of planning. Such a planning agency must necessarily consist of individuals made up from groups fully representative of the society and favorable to the modification of the established order toward more desirable goals. The machinery for such planning should be national in set-up and operation.*

Thus was sounded the clarion call for drastic, revolutionary change in the national economy through "planning" and government ownership of the banking institutions and all basic industries, with a system of "progressive education" in the public schools training the leadership for the planned economy which is to supplant our free competitive society.

At the 1935 NEA convention, Chairman Givens made his first appearance before the association as its duly elected executive secretary, a position he held until his retirement in 1952.† The following biographical sketch is from *NEA History*, by Mildred Sandison Fenner, assistant editor, *Journal of the NEA*, copyright and published, 1945, by National Education Association:

*Page 647 ff, *Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1934*.

†As of August 1, 1952, Dr. Givens was succeeded as executive secretary of NEA by William G(eorge) Carr, who had been associate secretary since 1940. Dr. Carr is the author of books, pamphlets and magazine articles in the fields of international relations and school finance and administration. He has served as secretary of the Educational Policies Commission of NEA and AASA; he was a member of the U. S. National Commission on UNESCO, 1945-50, and has been general secretary of the World Organization of the Teaching Profession since its organization in 1946.

Willard E. Givens, who received his bachelor's degree from Indiana University in 1913 and his master's from Columbia University in 1915, had been an instructor in the Naval Officers Training School at Mare Island during World War I; rural and high school teacher; elementary, junior and high school principal; superintendent of public instruction in Hawaii; superintendent of schools in San Diego and Oakland, California. Active in both civic and professional life, he was a former president of the California State Teachers Association, he had served as state director of National Education Association for Hawaii and California and had been a member of the NEA Committee on Social-Economic Goals.

Report of the Committee on Economic Goals had been published in the January, 1934, issue of *The Journal of the National Education Association* as an eight-page section which also was circulated in reprint form. Six men wrote the report. The authors: Fred J. Kelly, Chief, Higher Education Division, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., chairman; John Dewey, professor emeritus, Columbia University; Edward A. Ross, professor of sociology, University of Wisconsin; Robert C. Moore, secretary, Illinois State Teachers Association; Leon C. Marshall, sometime professor of law, Johns Hopkins University, and Dr. Givens. The report was embodied in and made part of the report of the larger committee headed by Dr. Givens.

The six-man committee report was milder in tone than that of the committee reporting to the Department of Superintendence. The new trend of thought among the educational leaders of the day was inferred rather than declared openly, though a careful reader might have discerned more than the writers intended

to be understood at the moment. As, for example, implications of the following paragraph are not too obscure:

(C) Placement and advancement — The individual worker today is in many cases so far removed from the control of his own occupational fate that society has a stake in connecting him with a fitting job and in seeing to it that progress in his occupation results normally from efficient work.

Continuing with examination of the proceedings of the 1934 meetings of NEA and its subsidiary groups, we find that a speaker at the annual meeting of the National Council of Education was W. E. Peik, then associate professor of education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Fifteen years later, this expert in education and administration was to be dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, and come to the defense of a former member of the college staff, Dr. Theodore Brameld of the University of New York.

It was while Dr. Brameld was a member of the Minnesota University faculty that he played a stellar role in conduct of an experiment in the Floodwood, Minn., high school. A group from the University headed by Dr. Brameld, demonstrated to the school faculty and the community the latest and most approved methods of indoctrination of adolescents with the philosophy and ideology of the Communist-Socialist movement.

Through the "educational process" as approved by the College of Education, and the Graduate School of the University, which financed the project, 51 juniors and seniors of the school were led to acceptance of such premises as these:

"Socialism and communism belong in the libertarian stream of democratic thought";

"Family life is in need of change in its traditional form";

"It is the business of government to see that every family attains a certain minimum in food, clothing and shelter"; and

"Government should take the responsibility for over-all planning for full employment."

The terminology in the four quoted statements just above is from Dr. Brameld's book, *Design for America*, published as an American Education Fellowship book, 1945, by Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, Inc. Content of the book is devoted exclusively to description of the techniques of the Floodwood experiment and accounting of the results.

One of the earlier publications of National Council for American Education, organized for the purpose of combatting Communist-Socialist infiltration into the schools, colleges and universities of the nation, was a critical review and appraisal of *Design for America*.

Published in leaflet form and in successively larger printings, this review was widely circulated. Naturally a great many copies went into Minnesota and the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, but it was more than a year before any mention of the book or criticism of it "crept into" Minneapolis newspapers, owned and controlled by the Cowles brothers.

At long last, a critical letter from a citizen was given space in the "Letters from the People" column of a Minneapolis daily newspaper. It did not appear even then until the editor had secured, for simultaneous publication, a ringing defense of Dr. Brameld and his book, written by Dean Peik.

The dean took the customary position—Dr. Brameld

was fully within his rights as an educator, and fully protected under the commonly accepted application of the principle of academic freedom. A fillip was added to the defense by editorial indulgence when, a little later, Dr. Brameld was given space for further reply which consisted almost entirely of highly colored charges levelled at National Council for American Education and its officers and writers.

Dr. Brameld is author of several books. His first, *A Philosophic Approach to Communism*, privately published, 1933, and distributed by The University of Chicago Libraries, was an expansion of his doctoral thesis submitted two years earlier "in candidacy for the degree of doctor of philosophy," which was duly granted by the University of Chicago.

Contemplating the epistemology of Communism through consideration, weighing and comparing the oftentimes conflicting theories of Hobbes and Mill, Locke and Hegel, Spinoza and Spargo, and scores of others, and with particular concern as to whether Communism is a philosophy of acquiescence or activity, Dr. Brameld leads his readers through 221 toilsome pages to come up with this, on Page 222: "And the devotee of Communism . . . becomes at once creator and worshipper of a magnificent human order." Cynical readers will suggest that this, apparently, was the aim and goal of the author, and that surely he could have reached it, as others have, by a far less tortuous path.

Dr. Brameld was at the University of Minnesota 1939 to 1947. During the last two years of his residence in Minneapolis, he served as member of the Mayor's Council on Human Relations. Hubert H. Humphrey, now U. S. Senator, was mayor at the time. It was during this Minneapolis residence, too, that his book, *Minority Problems in the Public Schools*, was

published by Harper & Brothers, 1946, as fourth of a series sponsored by the Bureau for Intercultural Education, with the American Council on Education and the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education of the National Education Association as cooperating advisers.

The Bureau was initiated through the vision of William Heard Kilpatrick, chairman of the board, it is revealed by an editorial note in the Brameld book.

It is common to "classify" Dr. Kilpatrick by quoting from *The Educational Frontier*, of which he was editor and joint author, contributing two chapters. John Dewey and V. T. Thayer were two of the best known of the other six authors. The book was published by The Century Co. in 1933.

Dr. Kilpatrick's *Education and the Social Crisis*, an expansion of his Kappa Delta Pi lecture of the same title, was published by Liveright Publishing Corporation in 1932. In it the author wrote:

To say that the profit motive is instinctive and must remain our sole or even principal reliance for human action is . . . to deny the most obvious facts of human conduct and history. No theoretical obstacle prevents effectual cooperative action. . . . Men can learn cooperation or they can learn cut-throat competition. It is the system now in vogue which teaches the latter, and men thus learn it. A cooperative system could as well teach cooperation. . . . We face then not a theoretical problem of whether it can be done but a practical problem of how to do it. The profit motive is no instinct, it is not fixed in human nature.

In neither of these books does Dr. Kilpatrick sound the call for indoctrination of pupils with the collectivist

ideology. He is "all out for" the planned economy, but shies away from open advocacy by the schoolmaster. Rather, he urges presentation of the competing ideologies in such a manner that the student will be helped to think his way through to the correct solution of the problem.

The respective spheres of activity of Dr. Kilpatrick and Dr. Brameld intersected when the latter's book on minority problems was published by a bureau founded by the former while he was a member of the board. They were to meet again.

This Happened in Pasadena, by David Hulburd, the Macmillan Co., 1951, reveals that about a year after Willard Goslin became superintendent of schools at Pasadena, California, he brought Dr. Kilpatrick to that city for five days of lectures before a summer workshop conducted for teachers of the Pasadena school system.

Mr. Hulburd's book was written ostensibly to explain why one of the nation's most highly touted school administrators, Superintendent Goslin, was asked by the Pasadena school board to tender his resignation before he had held the office for two years. Of course, according to Mr. Hulburd, it all happened because of the nasty machinations of enemies of education such as the National Council for American Education.

But like so many of the present-day writers of exposé books, Mr. Hulburd failed to reveal many things which, according to some observers and critics, were of no little importance in determining events and their outcome.

One of the things which Mr. Hulburd neglected to reveal to his readers is that Dr. Brameld also was brought to Pasadena upon the initiative of Superintendent Goslin. Dr. Brameld's mission in Pasadena

was to be a key figure in a human relations workshop project, which was supposed to break down interracial and other tensions presumed to be harmful to educational progress in Pasadena.

Dr. Brameld is reputed to be a "top drawer" expert in these matters; had he not written a book on the subject, which included surveys of inter-racial situations in a number of "anonymous" cities, with recommendations about what to do in the specific situations? And had he not served on the Mayor's Council on Human Relations in Minneapolis at the very time when Willard Goslin was superintendent of schools of that city?

The "wheels within wheels" have revolved, perhaps not just once but many times. And we are right back where we started—this is where we came in!

At the time Willard Goslin resigned as superintendent at Minneapolis to accept the Pasadena position, and during the period when he was arranging to bring Dr. Kilpatrick and Dr. Brameld to the California city, he was president of the American Association of School Administrators, which is the Department of Superintendence of National Education Association, to which, in 1934, Willard Givens made the report on "Education for the New America," sounding the tocsin for forthright advocacy of Socialism by the school teachers of America.

And, having given the readers of this book a glimpse of how the "wheels within wheels" revolve, and a quick characterization of typical prime movers in the revolution in educational practices, we can proceed with examination of words and deeds of men and women who formulate the policies of National Education Association, thereby making their impress upon the lives of millions of young people of our nation.

Communist-Socialist Propaganda in American Schools

I

FOLLOWING THE COMMUNIST- SOCIALIST "LINE"

So-called and self-styled progressive educators occupying policy-forming positions within National Education Association, and its divisions and departments, have not hesitated to use the exact language of the Communist-Socialist movement in describing their social-economic aims, and in urging teachers to indoctrinate youth of the land for acceptance of socialistic ideology and programs. The aims of these false leaders, of course, are identical with the immediate program of Communism-Socialism.

The declaration, "Without social and economic democracy, political democracy is a hollow sham," is typical Socialist party lingo. Perhaps more often it is stated from the positive view, that social and economic democracy are necessary to make political democracy really effective.

As quoted in the preceding paragraph, the declaration appears on Page 73, first page of the chapter "Obstacles to Democracy and Freedom," which is Chapter VII of *The Improvement of Education*, Fifteenth Yearbook (1937) of the Department of Super-

intendence, which is the American Association of School Administrators.

Only two major organizations in America, American Civil Liberties Union and American League Against War and Fascism, "are devoted to specifically warring upon Fascism," it is declared on Page 90.

American Civil Liberties Union is a fringe group "sparked" by Roger Baldwin. It has been called a Communist front by many government agencies, though it has escaped such designation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Not so the American League Against War and Fascism; this League has been recognized from the outset and by all agencies as Communist-inspired and Communist-operated, strictly for Communist Party purposes. Earl Browder served as vice-chairman until, when its reputation got so "smelly" that it no longer was proving effective, the League changed its name to American League for Peace and Democracy.

Incidentally, Earl Browder, for so many years secretary of the Communist Party, a position he held at the time this book was written and published, is referred to in the book, Page 83, as an "able and restrained radical." (Browder had been Party secretary since 1930, and its Presidential candidate in 1936.)

In this chapter under discussion, seven statements are quoted from the writings of Stuart Chase, or documented from his writings, this bibliography including his *The Economy of Abundance*, in which Chase reveals himself as a Socialist.

Other statements in the chapter are quoted or documented from writings of the pro-Communists George Seldes and Arthur Kallett, and the well known Socialists, Norman Thomas and Carl D. Thompson.

Bewailing the fact that the Socialist Party shows

little strength in American elections, and that the Communists appear even weaker as vote-getters, the authors find there is no "immediate hope for radicalism in the labor movement."

The authors explain that the farmers are unpredictable, following moderate radicals in times of depression, but voting for conservative candidates when times are prosperous. And as a final blow to immediate hope for radical developments, the authors mourn:

The great white-collar class of clerks and professional men and women is highly conservative in its outlook and tends to identify itself psychologically with its masters and with the economic interests of the latter.

America has no class system, and when the intelligentsia of the teaching profession speak of a "white-collar class," they are aping the European Socialist terminology. This is true also when employers are referred to as "masters." One might suppose that the classroom teachers of the nation, who surely are "professional men and women," would object to being classed as subservients of the "masters," but no protests or objections are of record.

Further cause for discouragement is found by the authors in the passing of liberalism in England, "killed by the World War." They express the fear that "even moderate socialism seems likely to go the way of liberalism," but the note of somber despair takes on a militant spirit as the authors see the Soviets pointing the way to better things:

almost everywhere it has broken down before the
It (moderate socialism) had an unparalleled opportunity at the close of the World War, but

onslaughts of Fascism. It may be that it is unfair to blame Socialism for this debacle of Socialist governments, but it cannot be denied that the prestige of Socialism has been vastly impaired by the collapse of the Socialist regimes in Italy, Germany, Austria and other countries. At the same time extreme socialism, namely revolutionary communism, has gained enormous prestige as a result of the conspicuous success of Soviet Russia in the face of almost unprecedented difficulties. (Page 85)

In the chapter section on "Pressure Groups and Democracy," the authors, chosen spokesmen of the American Association of School Administrators, spew their venom at an even longer list of patriotic organizations than was presented by Prof. Howard K. Beale in the 1937 yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. (See Chapter "Progressive Education 'Exposes' Propaganda" of this book.)

Like Professor Beale, the school administrators express extreme repugnance for "compulsory flag exercises and instruction in the legends and pageantry of the flag," military training in schools, compulsory teaching of history, and examination of textbooks. The declaration is made (Pages 76 and 77) that militaristic organizations seek "to intimidate or oust pacifistic or realistic teachers."

The spokesmen for the administrators are to be complimented upon their frankness of two points, (1) their frank admission of the close relationship between Communism and Socialism, and (2) the implied admission that there has been no move to oust teachers merely "on suspicion," but rather only those who admittedly are "pacifistic or realistic."

Frankness again breaks out all over our authors

when they pen Chapter VIII, "Processes of Social Change." This present writer has been studying radical literature for more than forty years, but does not recall a more exaggerated or more bitterly phrased statement of the "failure" of our American way of life.

Communists, Socialists, Technocrats and other "planners" have told us that we could shorten the work week and at the same time increase our standard of living. For nearly two decades we have been hearing repetition of the outrageous slander to the effect that one-third of our population is ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed. But these planners and critics are veritable Mister Milquetoasts as compared to the official spokesman for the AASA. Read from the opening paragraphs of Chapter VIII:

It is no exaggeration to say that in the United States of America today, with our marvelous technological equipment and our still abundant natural resources, we could produce, in not more than thirty hours of work per week for every able-bodied male and employed female in the country, all the goods, food, shelter, and services that the American population could use on a high standard of living. Thirty hours of work is probably too high a figure. We might well meet our needs in twenty hours of work. . . .

We could produce all the food needed on about one-fifth of the land and with about one-fifth of the farmers now involved in agricultural pursuits, provided we introduced the latest and best-known methods. . . . Yet over half of the American people, even in so-called prosperous times, go about inadequately clothed. Millions of them live in hovels and detestable slums. Even in 1929 three-fourths of the American families could not purchase for themselves a minimum health diet,

while nine-tenths of them were not able to obtain a liberal diet.

Of course our authors have a remedy, “‘social change’ in our day to take up this lag—this slack—and to create a social system harmonious in efficiency and ideals with our technological evolution.” And we had better get on with it, and fast, for:

If we do not bring our social system up to the level of achievement which we have attained in our material life, then our material life will revert to the more primitive and archaic character of our social system. This will mean the death of approximately half of our present population, for certainly a technology as outmoded and inefficient as our social system could sustain no more than half of the existing population.

Cultural lag as well as social-economic “slack” stand in the way of progress, our authors say. They mix the two rather indiscriminately in their discussion:

Our ideas of property came, for the most part, from the days of John Locke or before. Our constitutional system is based upon the adoption, a hundred and fifty years ago, of a mistaken conception of the British system of government made by the French philosopher, Montesquieu, two generations earlier. Our basic legal concepts, so closely linked up with property, derive from the natural law philosophers of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Our criminal jurisprudence is of even earlier origin.

Our social ideals are in a large part a heritage from European feudalism—even, in part, from the ideals of primitive chieftains—adapted to the

rewards and culture of an industrial age. Religion is still based upon supernatural assumptions and other-worldly considerations. Morals are purely a derivative from this supernaturalism and partly a protective device for the economic wrongdoings of the leisure class. Education transmits, for the most part, the traditions of a preindustrial age and the notions of a scarcity economy. Above all, we proceed upon the assumption that our economic life should be conducted for the profit of the few rather than for the service of the many.

The usual Communist-Socialist "fear technique" is applied in furtherance of the effort to get something like unanimous consent to a program of "gradualism." Our authors mince no words:

There are two possible methods of social change. One is orderly and gradual change, dominated by information and directed intelligence. The other is that violent change which we call revolution, based upon exasperation and desperation, motivated by hatred of oppression, and all too often guided by deep emotions rather than by informed intelligence. . . .

The present capitalistic and nationalistic social system has been supplanted in but one place—Russia—and that change was effected by revolution. Hence the verdict of history would seem to indicate that we are likely to have to depend upon revolution for social change of an important and far-reaching character. . . .

That there was so little bloodshed in the Russian Revolution was due to the fact that the World War had all but paralyzed the old regime, and the nobility and middle class which had to be overcome or liquidated were not relatively numerous.

It is difficult to see how the authors could have made it plainer that the Utopia of the Communist-Socialist movement is their social-economic objective, and that they are not averse to revolutionary methods if they prove necessary or advisable for accomplishment of the aim.

This position was not new in 1937. It had been "announced" at NEA's annual meeting in 1934, as is noted in the Introduction of this little book. It was full-fledged in the Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence the following year. This Yearbook was published under the title *Social Change and Education*. In a chapter titled "A Preface to a New American Philosophy of Education," John L. Childs of Teachers College, Columbia University, and then a member of the Commission on Education for New Social and Economic Relationships, voiced these same sentiments on Pages 137-138 in the following.

Confronted with a rapidly changing economy, American educators cannot serve the youth of our country by continuing to make them intellectually and emotionally loyal to many of the doctrines contained in our traditional social philosophy. . . .

Enough data are now available . . . to show the general direction in which we must go. Industrialism points to national social planning. Our national ideal of social democracy requires that this planning be under collective control. Collective control cannot be made a reality in a regime of private ownership of the basic industries. Undoubtedly we can learn much from the experience of other countries, particularly Russia, but we . . . need not prematurely assume that collective planning and dictatorial bureaucratic regimentation of social life are necessarily correlatives.

It would of course be more scholarly and more realistic if the superintendents of instruction would accept the fact that it is no premature assumption that any planned economy must be based upon bureaucratic control. If society (government) is to plan for people, attempting to guarantee that individually and collectively they will enjoy the "good life," then government must plan the lives of its citizens in minutest detail.

Of course our so-called progressive educators scorn the lessons of history, but this is most unwise; the future can be predicted only on the basis of what has happened in the past, and history has shown that government control over the lives and actions of its citizens progresses almost exactly in proportion to the "advance" toward "total planning."

Finally, returning to the philosophic approach, when a government has assumed ownership and control of the "means of life," which are the processes of production and distribution of goods and services, it has become totalitarian—nothing in the realm of material things remains for it to seize—and by definition and in practice, a totalitarian government is based upon the ultimate in bureaucracy.

For example, if government is to arrange for production of all necessary agricultural products with one-fifth of the land and one-fifth of the labor now devoted to this field of endeavor, which is declared possible by our authors, as noted earlier in this chapter, certainly the planners must have in mind the abolition of the one-family farm and introduction of collective farming on a stupendous scale, with agricultural labor completely "militarized" and moving from place to place and job to job at command of an agricultural "authority" with limitless powers.

In this same Yearbook of 1935, Prof. Jesse H. Newlon, director of Lincoln School, Teachers College, Columbia University, since 1927, voiced typical Columbia viewpoint of acceptance of the Marxian class struggle theory. The following quotation is from Pages 159-160 of the chapter, "The Teaching Profession and Social Policy:"

In considering the problem of how teachers may actively participate in shaping social policy in community, state, and nation, we are confronted by two basic facts. Notwithstanding that teachers have long looked forward to a classless society, our society is still divided into classes that are becoming more sharply differentiated. . . .

Further developing its views on the education of youth "for democracy," the Department of Superintendence devoted its Sixteenth Yearbook, 1938, to subjects indicated by the title, *Youth Education Today*, prepared by the department's Commission on Youth Problems.

The authors show concern for family and other influences touching the lives of youth, these naturally including various types of youth organizations, such as Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts; church, municipal and fraternity-sponsored groups; agricultural groups such as 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers and Junior Grange; organizations sponsored by the Federal Government, and finally, purely commercial projects such as movies, road houses and pool halls.

Results of several "surveys" are included. One of these indicates the authors' distrust of adult-sponsored and directed groups such as are included in the classifications named in the preceding paragraph. State directors of the National Youth Administration were

asked to report the extent of self-motivated youth organizations.

Twenty-five directors reported that they knew of no such organizations, and a number cited such organizations as Four-H Clubs and other groups which actually are adult-directed. And finally:

Only thirteen (directors) cited examples of what might really be termed self-motivation, such as local youth forums, orchestras and community groups. The American Youth Congress was mentioned by eight of the thirteen directors as being an active youth organization representing youth initiative.

These reports were passed over without further comment; presumably they were accepted as factual and realistic. Whether this be considered the result of ignorance, indifference, or acceptance of the aims and purposes of the American Youth Congress, the result is the same: the reader is led to the assumption that the Congress actually was a youth-motivated organization with worthwhile aims.

The truth, as explained in the chapter "Building America" of this present book, is that American Youth Congress, as it operated from 1934 to 1941, was described by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "one of the most influential front organizations ever set up by the Communists in this country." The Congress, of course, was youth-motivated only to the extent that it was managed and directed by the Young Communists, who, in turn, were directly under the strict control of the Communist Party.

To this point it has been shown that official spokesmen for National Education Association follow the Communist-Socialist "line" in many ways, including

use of the exact terminology of the Marxists; praise of Socialism and of Socialist policies and organizations; ridiculing patriotic organizations; deprecating achievements of the American way of life on the one hand and making absurdly exaggerated statements of what could be accomplished under a Communist or Socialist regime; making claims that the coming of collectivism in some form is inevitable, and using the "fear technique" to persuade people to accept "gradualism" and "peaceful" change as the only way to avoid violent and bloody revolution.

Only a few of the Communist-Socialist techniques involved in the process of following the "line" are mentioned in the preceding paragraph. More of the methods used in "following the line" will be pointed out, and documented, in the following chapter, "Using Communist-Socialist Techniques."

II

USING COMMUNIST-SOCIALIST
TECHNIQUES

No technique of the propagandists for Communism-Socialism is more satisfying to its users, or more effective in preparing the minds of both adults and young people for acceptance of the Marxian ideology, than the "debunking" of American history, which includes gross misrepresentation of the character and aims of the Founders and of the historical documents which they wrote.

Following through with disclosure of National Education Association "exploits" in this "debunking" and other use of Communist-Socialist techniques, is no more than continuation of documentation of NEA practices in following the Communist "line," discussed in the previous chapter.

Other Communist-Socialist techniques used by NEA spokesmen include praise of Soviet "accomplishments" and apologies for Soviet brutality; teaching the Marxian doctrine of class struggle, in part by sly insinuations that American society is made up of classes; teaching that "change"—always, of course, in the direction of collectivism—is not only inevitable but desirable, and using crude Communist tricks to make it appear that Communism-Socialism is the only antidote for Fascism, with Communists and Socialists presented as the only true anti-Fascists.

For some examples of the use of Communist-Socialist techniques mentioned above, centering around

perversions of history, we turn to *The Study and Teaching of American History*, the Seventeenth Yearbook of The National Council for the Social Studies, 1946.

Teachers are solemnly advised, Page 71, that one of the principal tasks assigned to instructors in history is to make certain that students see the "intimate relation between the saga of the past and the pressing problems of the present." Developing this point, the *Yearbook* continues:

Let us relate the present complexities in building a workable peace to historical investigations of world courts and leagues of nations. Let us in our teaching draw parallels—for instance pointing out that Russia's suspicion of the world parallels the attitude of the young and insecure American nation of the nineteenth century. Let us teach the Monroe doctrine and our relationship with South America in such a way that each recurring Argentinian crisis would not appear novel and soluble only on the basis of expediency. In short, let us relate Green to Gompers, FDR to Progressivism, Southern reactionary senators to reconstruction, and inflation today to inflation after other wars.

While comments of this kind may belong more properly in other connections, it is impossible to avoid pointing to the above characterization of the world attitude of the Russian Soviets in 1946 as paralleling that of the United States during the period 1801 to 1900. Merely to point it out is sufficient—no comment is necessary.

History teachers must be careful to allow students no more than cautious samplings of the myths, legends

and folklore which abound in American history as it was taught before the "revisionists" showed us our foibles and follies and obligingly rewrote our national "biography."

The "revisionists" eliminated not only the tale of the boy George Washington and the cherry tree, but also the wierd yarns about "Plymouth Rock, the hiding of the Connecticut Charter in the Charter Oak, the legend of the Connecticut blue laws, Washington taking command of the Continental troops under the Cambridge Elm, Jefferson riding on horseback to his inauguration, the legend of Daniel Boone, the legendary saving of Oregon by Marcus Whitman, the alleged 'appetites and passions' of Daniel Webster, the Lincoln-Ann Rutledge legend (and) the legendary account of Lincoln's composition of the Gettysburg Address." (Temporarily, at least, they let us retain Paul Revere's ride.)

Incidentally, several chapters of the *Yearbook*, including the one on the important subject, "Constitutional Development," convey little more to the reader than an outline, as the chapters appear to have been written primarily to serve as bibliographies of the "revisionist" writings.

But to return to consideration of myths and legends and other allegedly false teaching of the past: the *Yearbook* declares that it is important that this situation be rectified else "dangerous concepts of national self-righteousness" may be cultivated, or the "American dream" taken too seriously.

If Americans think too highly of their country, the *Yearbook* warns, they may again place reliance upon "legends that have done irreparable damage in the past, and even today have afterglows that tend to con-

tinue antagonistic attitudes toward other nations.”
Continuing, Page 91:

Other traditions in American history are of a broader, a more fundamental sort. Of these some have become part of the American dream and have inspired American people and their leaders to high achievement and will continue to do so. Among these are the legend of equality of opportunity, and the idea of a relatively classless society. Realistic American history can show actual gains toward realizations instead of developing complacent attitudes in future citizens by painting ideals as if they were already accomplished. The belief in laissez faire as a traditional policy in American government rests upon a lack of knowledge and comprehension concerning the role of the national government in its relation to such problems as the tariff, education, road building, defense against the Indians, and the early assumption by local or state governments of provision for education, street lighting, fire protection, water supply and sanitation. The legend that the Constitution of the United States as made by its framers established a perfect government that must be “protected” as it *was* framed presupposes that citizens are incapable of thinking reasonably, for otherwise how can they fail to discover that the very change inherent in history itself has been responsible for considerable constitutional development since 1789? Yet this legend seems to merit the protective aegis of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for as recently as May, 1946, its Continental Congress passed a resolution urging its member chapters “to undertake a campaign of education that will result in better understanding of and appreciation for the kind of

government that was established by the framers of the Constitution.”

The foregoing rather long paragraph has crowded into it not one but half-dozen examples of use of the Communist-Socialist technique, including assumption of the desirability of change, always to the left; indirect teaching of the class struggle; belittling of our Constitution, and excoriation of all defenders of that document and admirers of the type of government established by that document.

In addition there is the assumption that all change made in our Constitution, by amendment through Constitutional means and by the courts, has been “development,” or in the nature of progress, and use of the old technique of presenting socialization of business and industry as no more than extension of the governmental ventures in community services.

For further examples of teaching the desirability and inevitability of change—to the left—we turn to *The Social Studies Curriculum*, Fourteenth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, 1936. In the chapter “The Role of Education and the School,” the Yearbook quotes, Page 28, with high approval, the Committee on the Social Studies, American Historical Association, as follows:

Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and *laissez faire* in economy and government is closing and that an age of collectivism is emerging.

Surely the foregoing makes it clear enough for all to understand that National Education Association

leadership no longer has faith in the American way of life. Perhaps the following is not quite so plain, but there are clear implications in a statement of purpose of the social studies program, page 57:

A second purpose of instruction in the social studies grows out of the first, namely, preparation of pupils for promoting a wiser and more effective cooperation among regions, areas, individuals, groups, communities, states, and nations—a co-operation interracial, interreligious and intereconomic.

If any American parents are sending their sons and daughters to school under assumption that pupils are being taught history and current events in an objective manner, they should be warned from the foregoing that, if the teachers are following the recommendations of the recognized and accepted leaders of the profession, the youngsters in the schools are being indoctrinated and trained in “preparation for promoting” whatever wild schemes may be hatched in the councils of the higher-ups.

Further palaver about the inevitability and desirability of “change” appears on Page 115 of this same Fourteenth *Yearbook* of the Social Studies Council, as follows:

There are some aspects of nature that man cannot control; hence he must make the necessary adaptation to them. There are conditions in man's relationships with others over which he has no control; so he must make the necessary adaptations. Economic, social and political conditions are constantly changing. Man's adaptation to this change must be a continuous process. In

fact, the keynote of the entire social studies program might well be CHANGE. It is inevitable and it is desirable. An understanding of the process and an ability to adapt are essential to effective living in the contemporary world.

Class struggle teaching is given a vicious slant in the closing phrases of discussion along these lines on Pages 256-257 of *Improving the Teaching of World History*, Twentieth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1949. This *Yearbook* was edited by Edith West, a director of the Council, and head of the Department of Social Studies, University of Minnesota High School, Minneapolis. Quoting:

The great political aspiration of the proletariat during the 19th century was to bring about universal suffrage, majority rule, and democracy. At the opening of the 19th century the masses were excluded from suffrage in every modern state. By the close of the century they had gained this right in every progressive country of the western world.

Though the working classes thus won the right to participate in politics, they have been disappointed with the results that have come from this victory. Despite the fact that the right to vote put the working classes, rural and urban, in a position of numerical preponderance, they were nowhere able to control the government or policies of any leading modern state until some of the violent overturns following the first World War.

Lack of space in this chapter makes it necessary to overlook some of the numerous false assumptions presented in the foregoing. Only two will be mentioned, these requiring a minimum of discussion.

- 1.—The *Yearbook* sponsors accept the baseless as-

sumption that since at no time in the 19th century did workers at the polls elect to office men pledged to inaugurate a Socialist state, in some manner or other their wills were thwarted. Of course the truth is that, in America in particular—certainly one of the modern states—the majority of the workers never had heard of Socialism or had but the vaguest ideas about it, and would have rejected it if they had known all about it.

2.—The *Yearbook* sponsors accept the equally baseless assumption that after violent overturns following World War I, the workers did come into control. The most notable of the violent overturns, and the only ones which readily come to mind, are the seizure of power by the Nazis in Germany and the Bolshevik revolution in Russia. It is indeed difficult to conceive how any American can believe that workers ever controlled either Nazi Germany or the Russian Soviets; both were dictatorships of most extreme type.

In this same *Twentieth Yearbook*, Page 255, we find a typical example of the scorn of National Education Association leaders for national constitutions and constitutional government in all countries. In the view of these leaders, a constitution is nothing more nor less than a device of the ruling class to fasten its control even more firmly upon the government and the working class, though admittedly the middle class might reap some minor benefits. Quoting:

One of the most important institutional results of the Industrial Revolution upon Western society has been its political effects, manifested in the development of constitutionalism, nationalism, democracy, and imperialism. Most of these political developments of the 19th and early 20th centuries reflected the economic, social, and political ambitions of the capitalists. These were, chiefly,

the legal protection of property, enforcement of contract, *laissez faire* with respect to economic life and activities, and extensive freedom of personal and business initiative.

The practical results of these bourgeoisie political ideas were manifested directly in the development of constitutional government. The great value of a constitution to the middle-class businessman is that it gives unusual permanence to the political system and renders the citizen and his business relatively free from arbitrary or precipitate interference on the part of the government. Constitutions usually embodied the civil liberties demanded by the middle class: freedom of speech, press, religion and assembly, trial by jury, and the like.

Naturally *Social Education*, official publication of the Social Studies Council, follows along on the "line" and uses the Communist-Socialist techniques proposed and advocated by Council leaders. From an article, "Liberal Living and the Spirit of '76," by Richard Bardolph, assistant professor of history of the Woman's College, University of North Carolina, in issue of April, 1951, we quote:

The original statement of the American dream of a decent, democratic society was first drafted, by scholarly men, in the Declaration of Independence and the first state constitutions of the newly independent commonwealths. Thereupon, quickly recovering itself, an alarmed bourgeoisie, frightened at the prospect of populist and democratic excesses, and with the alarums of Captain Shays ringing in their ears, promptly—almost furtively—drafted a conservative constitution omitting all reference to personal freedom and erecting elab-

orate defenses for property. From that time forward, the stresses engendered by the conflict of property rights and human rights has brought us by fits and starts closer to the espousal of the latter at the expense of the former if the difference could not be composed without injury to either.

Quite aside from the fact that true history tells us that the states adopted the Constitution only after agreement had been reached that the Bill of Rights was to be adopted at early date, this writer adopts as his own the old Communist prattle about "property rights." The truth is, of course, that there is no such thing as "property rights"—property has no rights! But one of the most important of personal rights is the right to own property; this right is so ancient and so well established that it is mentioned in two of the Ten Commandments—"Thou shalt not steal . . ." and "Thou shalt not covet . . ."

One example of use of the purely Communist (not Socialist) technique of apologizing for, even lauding the Russian Soviets, was given earlier in this chapter in connection with development of another of the techniques. Two more examples, plus another "combination" which includes this technique, will be given from the vast array which is available.

Turning back to the *Fourteenth Yearbook* of the Department of Superintendence, we read, Page 98, in connection with description of the type of world federation advocated by Union Now:

No one is competent to say, either, just when the practice of democracy has reached the high degree of perfection which would entitle a people to belong to the Union. That line would be

very hard to draw in Latin America, and it would take a Solomon to apply it to Russia. Many Americans are certain that the Russians live under a cruel and bloody autocracy, while the Russians themselves claim that they have the best form of democracy. Obviously, just what democracy is becomes a delicate thing to define. It is not democracy to us unless the personal freedoms and rights of the individual flourish. It is democracy to the Russians if the great mass of the people have some part in the swift up-building of their great domain and in the management of its affairs.

What is of cardinal importance is the fact that Russia is rapidly evolving. We do not know exactly into what, but no understanding of Russia, or of the problem of world peace, is possible if we start on the assumption that Russia is still the 1917 land of bloody communist revolution. We are not justified either in assuming that our own democracy reached a fixed and eternal pattern in 1789.

Surely we may feel grateful to the author and sponsors of the above quotation that, departing from the usual techniques, the author admits that democracy is not easy to define, and that it has different meanings in different situations. Aside from this admission, the author accomplishes nothing of which he should be proud.

When he, the author, declares that "Russia is rapidly evolving" away from bloody dictatorship, he is making a statement which is not true today and was not true when the Yearbook was published (1936). He was engaging in wishful thinking.

It is true that under the Marxian theory, the dictatorship should have begun "melting away" long ago,

but it has not happened. Nor in other regards have the Soviets "evolved" according to the Marxian predictions. Early it was found that the Marxian slogan-premise, "from each according to his abilities, and to each according to his needs" was unworkable. Systems of incentives had to be "borrowed" from the hated capitalist system before the wheels of industry and business would begin to turn, and introduction of these incentives has resulted in disparities in scales of living which are far greater than exist in America today.

Too, the best information that we can get from behind the Iron Curtain—and labor organizations just now are collecting tremendous masses of evidence—goes to show that the "labor camps," to give them a polite name, are more numerous and more densely populated than ever before, and that no Soviet citizen, from dictator down to lowliest peasant, can retire to rest in his bed at home with any feeling of assurance that the morning will find him in the same place, alive and momentarily safe from assassination or "extradition."

"Education for International Affairs" is the title of an article by Vera Micheles Dean which appears in the April, 1949 issue of *Social Education*, with the following explanation: "This article . . . originally appeared in the *Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin* (February, 1948). Permission to reprint was generously granted by the editor of the *Bulletin* and the author, who is well known to social studies teachers as the research director of the Foreign Policy Association, in which position she has been of great service to the schools."

The type of "service" which this well known apologist for the Soviets has offered to the schools, and the public generally, or so much of the public as would lis-

ten to her, is shown in the following quotation from the above-mentioned article:

We must teach history horizontally, not vertically. By this I mean that, instead of running through the history of England, or the United States, or Russia, from earliest times to the present day, we should teach it period by period, comparing the development of major countries at a given time in history. History taught in this form would save us from such misconceptions as the widespread assumption that conditions in Russia, whose development is about fifty years behind that of the Western World, are comparable either favorably or unfavorably to those in Britain and the United States.

If we were to accept Mrs. Dean's assumption that Russia is a half-century behind the United States and Britain in industrial development, would we then have to assume that this fact accounts for, or excuses, the attitude of Russia to the other nations of the world, or the brutalities of the dictatorship that exists within the realm of the Soviets? Though the answer will not be pleasing to Mrs. Dean and her ilk, surely it must be "No."

And can we be certain that Mrs. Dean is correct in her assumption that Russia actually lags behind some fifty years in industrial development? Again the answer must be "No."

Official spokesmen for the Soviets make no such claims as that advanced by Mrs. Dean. Rather, they declare that the nation and its citizens are better off than other nations; for one thing, they claim that the Soviets have a tremendous advantage over every other nation in the world in that they are completely self-

sufficient, having within the borders of the Soviets and the satellite countries all the raw materials necessary for the manufacture of everything the nation needs.

This claim has been made many times by Soviet apologists who are less coy and more free-spoken than Mrs. Dean. It appears, for example, in a booklet titled "Soviet Aggression: Myth or Reality," written and published by Corliss Lamont. The booklet bears no date, but was written only recently, as shown by the dates mentioned in the following quotation:

Repeated and reliable reports from Soviet Russia during the period of the Fourth Five-Year Plan, 1946-50, indicate that the Soviet people are in fact preoccupied with tremendous projects of peaceful economic construction and that their minds are not dwelling upon dreams of military conquest. The Five-Year Plan recently completed attained most of its main social and economic goals. Instead of a serious inflation due to disproportionate war preparations, as in the United States, the Soviet Union has put through four general price reductions of a sweeping nature since the close of the war. The last of these occurred in March, 1951, and lowered prices on a multitude of consumer goods from ten to thirty percent.

With no more than passing expression of the hope that all readers of Mr. Lamont's pamphlet will follow his example rather than his alluring description of conditions in the Soviets, and will refrain from seeking residence in the Soviets, we pass on to the "combination" examples previously mentioned. It is to be found on Pages 40-41 of *Americans All: Studies in Intercultural Education*.

This book was published, 1942, by the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of National Education Association and jointly sponsored by that department and the National Council of Teachers of English and The Society for Curriculum Study. Quoting:

Only as we fully understand the manifestations of fascism can we guard against its encroachment in the United States. As we study its use of prejudices we can appreciate the importance of eliminating these evils from our own nation.

Much of the above discussion applies also to Communism. In this case, however, the Russian minority groups in America do not constitute any appreciable reservoir of sympathy for that way of life. It is desirable that our young people be fully informed concerning the way of life in the Soviet Union. Critical study will enable them to understand the full implications of Marxism as it has unfolded in Russia and as it would probably develop here if our domestic Communists had their way. In respect to the undeniable achievements of the Soviet Union, we have the task of deciding which of their social innovations can be modified to enrich a truly democratic way of life and which are utterly antagonistic to a life of freedom. Any such study would develop a greater appreciation of the tremendous potentialities of democracy in our country.

The foregoing quotation is from the chapter "Forming Attitudes," by William W. Wattenberg of Chicago Teachers College, Chicago, Illinois.

The amount of propaganda which has been crowded into these two paragraphs is nothing short of astounding. Note how slyly the author injects the idea that

fascism is a great danger to America, but that there is little sympathy for Communism in our country, hence little to be feared.

Then comes the flat statement—"undeniable"—that the Soviets are a land of tremendous achievements. Were the author referring to industrial development, few would disagree: certainly industrial production has risen by leaps and bounds in the Soviets under the dictatorship. But it is fully apparent that what the author refers to are the "social innovations" of the Soviet regime.

If we will but study carefully the benefits and blessings of these social innovations inaugurated by the Soviets, and choose wisely from among them for grafting upon the social-economic system of our country, perhaps modifying them somewhat prior to the grafting, our democratic way of life can be greatly enriched, this teacher of teachers tells all the teachers who can be inveigled into reading his treacherous propaganda.

And what social innovations should we examine and study in hope that they will be found adaptable for use in America? Would they be freedoms of the citizens? Surely not—they have not been innovations in America since they were incorporated in the Bill of Rights which make up the first ten amendments to the Constitution. Would they be wide-spread educational facilities, or public health measures, or humane care for the aged, infirm, dependent and unfortunate, or rehabilitation of the wayward?

No, it would be none of these: the Soviets have nothing along these lines to match what we have in America. On the matter of the last-named point above, no nation in the world has inaugurated such elaborate, and expensive, methods for reforming men and women who have broken the laws of the country. In the Soviets,

on the other hand, a citizen need be only suspected of rebellion against authority, and off he goes to a lingering death in a "work camp."

The one social innovation which is viewed longingly by the misty-eyed intelligentsia of many professions, including educators, is abolition of private property in favor of "collectivism"; the publications of National Education Association and its divisions, departments and commission are replete with evidence of this treachery against our American Republic.

In furtherance of their desire to promote the ideology of collectivism, false leaders are willing to stoop to the lowest and slimiest of Communist-Socialist tricks.

One of these tricks, frequently used because it "takes in" gullible people as well as many on the fringe of the intelligentsia who claim to be exceptionally wise, is to declare that all anti-Communists must be, *per se*, pro-fascist. Or, stating this outlandish claim in another way, only Communism is truly anti-fascist.

For further example of presentation of the idea that it is fascism rather than Communism which we have to fear here in America, we turn back to the Fourteenth *Yearbook* of the Social Studies Council. Prof. Linden A. Mander, Australian-born-and-educated member of the faculty of the University of Washington, holding a chair of political science, wrote Chapter 2, titled "Interdependence of Nations and Individuals." On pages 38-39 we read:

Proponents of economic nationalism . . . urge that it is better to maintain stable prices at home rather than to submit to the uncertainties of foreign exchange. They point to the many instances which seem to show that competition for foreign trade has led to colonial rivalries, struggles for

markets, and even to war itself. They also assert that the self-regulating and automatic character of the nineteenth-century capitalist system has largely broken down, that the law of supply and demand no longer freely operates, and that competition no longer directly affects the level of prices. Therefore, they advocate a planned national economy which should be self-sufficient and independent of the capriciousness and uncertainties of world trade.

Here Professor Mander charges that opponents of world government and supporters of protective tariff measures—presumably the same persons—come naturally to advocacy of a “planned national economy.” He cannot, of course, mean a socialist planned economy; he must mean a fascist type of economy.

Perhaps his meaning may not be clear to the uninitiated, and perhaps he “planned it that way.” But to make certain that those who really want to know what he means can find out without too much trouble, he provides a footnote which advises that “fuller treatment” can be found in his book, *Foundations of Modern World Society*, Stanford University Press, 1941, Pages 181–84 and 188–92. On these pages we find descriptions of the programs used by the fascist regimes of Germany and Italy in effort to attain self-sufficiency, and on Page 183:

When the economic crash came, and debtor countries one by one defaulted, people began to speak of the hazardous nature of foreign trade . . . and to ask whether it would not be better to adopt a planned economy within the nation itself. . . . Planned economy thus became the ally of economic nationalism. By nationalizing eco-

conomic life within the nation and adopting the open door at home, a country could escape from dependence upon an unstable and unpredictable international world.

The reader will note the neat switch from "economic nationalism," previously presented as the desire to be economically independent of other countries, to "nationalizing economic life," which, of course is the collectivist program along fascist lines.

Professor Mander's footnote also sends the really inquiring reader to Pages 327-33 of *World Economy in Transition*, by Eugene Staley, associate professor of international economic relations, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, and published by the Council on Foreign Relations, 1939. The professor wrote the book under the auspices of the American Coordinating Committee for International Studies, as a report to be submitted to the Twelfth Session of the International Studies Conference at Bergen, Norway, Aug.-Sept., 1939. On Page 329 we read:

The world economy of the immediate future will have to be a "mixed" system in two senses. In most countries the principle of free enterprise and the principle of conscious control over economic life (by government or by large organizations) will have to function side by side. . . . The key to the problem of making laissez faire and planning work side by side with a minimum of friction and a maximum of benefit for economic welfare is this: make laissez faire competitive rather than monopolistic and make planning positive rather than restrictive.

So, it is quite clear from his writings and his refer-

ences, Professor Mander is certain that we must have a planned economy. No choice is open except fascism, Communism-Socialism, or a mixed economy, which, certainly, will grow more collectivist as time passes and "society develops."

And it must not be forgotten that these false prophets warn that our capitalist system, with the assistance of greedy capitalists, most easily develops into a fascist system, and therefore it is these greedy capitalists that we must watch, and whose activities we must curb; the Communists are harmless folk, at least relatively, and the collectivist system which they advocate has fully as many good points as it has possibilities for destroying the scant freedoms which Americans enjoy under the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

III

BROADENING PROPAGANDA FIELD

Supplementing its program of indoctrination of youth with the ideologies of collectivism, leaders of the National Education Association are reaching out with programs designed to influence the general public.

In the main, this outside-the-school propaganda is "mild"; much of it is well concealed in a mass, or maze, of harmless verbiage. Some of this "dilutant" might pass as "good" if it stood alone.

It is an old trick of Communist-Socialist propagandists to offer great quantities of materials which will prove acceptable to Americans, particularly at the outset of a specific campaign.

To date, four editions of *The American Citizens Handbook* have been published. The first printing of the first edition was in March, 1941. Two printings were made of each of the first three printings, and to date, one printing of the fourth edition. A total of 70,000 copies has been printed. The *Handbook* is priced at \$2.00 per copy.

Included in the worthwhile material to be found in this well-bound, well-illustrated *Handbook* is a section devoted to short biographical sketches, with portraits, of all Americans who have been elected to the Hall of Fame at New York University. Each sketch includes a quotation from the writings of the subject.

In the section "Facts for Every Citizen," one of the good features is brief sketches of each of the forty-eight states of the Union, with the state seal shown for each. Another subsection gives short sketches of the member states of the United Nations.

Part IV of the *Handbook*, 55 pages, is devoted to the United Nations. The first page describes Woodrow Wilson's effort to establish the League of Nations, and closes with this paragraph:

Wilson and the League were rejected by a nation eager to return to "normalcy," and at the time of his death on February 3, 1924, he was a broken and defeated man. Yet so true was his vision and so practical his idealism, that their ultimate achievement thru the United Nations has become the goal of peace-loving men and women the world over.

Unwavering confidence in the United Nations, and willingness of National Education Association to use any and every propaganda device to make it appear that there can be no valid objection to any of the plans and programs advocated by proponents of this particular route toward world-super-government, has been disclosed in the chapter of this little book entitled "Promoting International Collectivism."

This general attitude is further disclosed in the *Handbook*. The United Nations section includes the UN Charter, the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Of course there is no hint of the dangers to American liberties which are inherent in these documents. One would hope that honest supporters of United Nations would frown upon such propaganda methods.

Part VII of the *Handbook*, "A Golden Treasury for the Citizen," 125 pages, is devoted to "literary gems" of the American culture, gleaned from "Sacred Writings" and secular sources. The "Sacred Writings" include "The Secret of Happiness," by Confucius, some Proverbs of Hindustani, and Sayings of

Mohammed. The secular writings include this choice bit from the pen of Langston Hughes:

DREAMS

Hold fast to dreams.
For if dreams die
Life is a broken-winged bird
That cannot fly.
Hold fast to dreams.
For when dreams go,
Life is a barren field
Frozen with snow.

Perhaps realism and accuracy are not requirements for deathless poesy; certainly the quoted quatrains are neither realistic nor accurate. Snow does not freeze fields; rather, it protects fallow soil from root-killing freezing. But it runs in the mind of this humble scribe that he has heard that critics of poetry do not look kindly upon such "mixing of metaphors" as that indulged in by the quoted writer.

Even were these Hughes stanzas the rarest gems of poetry ever penned, surely they could have been spared from a *Handbook* such as this one is professed to be, since the author has made it all too plain that his first allegiance is to Soviet Russia rather than to America. Many will believe that placing this writing in the *Handbook* is a gesture of bravado on the part of the responsible editors.

The Langston Hughes "gem" is published also in Personal Growth Leaflet No. 288, *Selections for Memorizing*, Grade 8, one of a "set" with the same general title, for Grades 1 to 16. All these selections are included in the "Golden Treasury" section of the *Handbook*.

The publisher, National Education Association, tells

the story of these leaflets on Page 2 of No. 36:

Personal Growth Leaflets first appeared in *The Journal* of the National Education Association as commencement messages to young people. A demand for copies led to leaflet editions which were widely distributed. These came to the attention of Hugh Taylor Birch, who as a boy in Yellow Springs, Ohio, had known Horace Mann. Mr. Birch was so impressed by the leaflets that in December 1938 he gave a revolving fund to extend their publication through mass production. The demand has grown amazingly until sales are now over a million copies yearly. All money received goes back into the Fund to add to the service. Editorial work on the leaflets has been done by Joy Elmer Morgan, editor of *The Journal*, assisted by members of *The Journal* staff. Typography and cover designs are by Erle Prior, art editor of *The Journal*.

According to a list received in midsummer, 1951, 300 titles of Personal Growth Leaflets have been published, and about 135 titles are kept in print and available for sale. Except for a few of double size, the leaflets have 16 pages; the page size is three by five inches.

Effective Jan. 1, 1951, the price of the leaflets was raised from one cent to two cents each. Even at the higher price the booklets are heavily subsidized. Attractive bulk and group offers are made, as well as combination offers with the *Handbook*, which also is "under the wing" of the Hugh Birch-Horace Mann Fund.

Some of the more popular titles, and the number published, as announced on copies currently sold, are *Education and Human Relations*, 382,000; *A Century*

of Consumer Cooperation, 379,000; *World Citizenship*, 80,000; *Heirs of Democracy*, 280,000; *Education and Human Relations*, 382,000; *Your Citizenship in the Making*, 362,000; *The Code of the Good American*, 561,000; *Seven Adventures in Pioneering*, 279,500; *Ethics for Teachers*, 1,052,000; *Social Imagination in Education*, 250,000; *Your Life in the Making*, 840,000; *An American Program of Plenty*, 295,000; *Economic Systems in the United States*, 255,000; *The Task Before Us*, by John Dewey, 30,000, and *The Tenth Generation*, 329,000.

In the *Seven Adventures* leaflet the author, Harry A. Overstreet, outlines seven notable achievements in America, but matches each with what the author claims is dismal failure. The presumption is that the net result of Americans' efforts to progress is exactly zero.

Admitting that man has conquered Nature, bending her forces to human needs and desires, and that a great part of this conquest has been the result of American enterprise, the author counters with this:

Our conquest of Nature has likewise had its defeat. Ostensibly, by means of the machine, we were to liberate man. As a matter of fact, we have permitted him to become further enslaved. With remarkable powers at our command for the release of life we have permitted life to be bound by new fetters.

This is the merest drivel. Propagandists like this author who can see nothing good in America moan, for example, about the sad fate of the worker on the production line who performs but one operation. They would have us believe that the blacksmith, gunsmith, or other artisan who toiled over forge or bench for 70 to 84 hours a week, lived in a hovel and wore a leather

jerkin seven days of the week, was a happier, freer man than the present-day factory worker who labors 40 hours a week, or less, with two completely free days, and drives to work in his own car.

Joy Elmer Morgan, previously identified, wrote *Your Life in the Making*. This author insists that "You live in a democracy." This point is sufficiently discussed in the chapter of this book titled "NEA's Preoccupation with Democracy."

The booklet on *Consumer Cooperation* was written by C. J. McLanahan, educational director of the Co-operative League of America, and follows the propaganda line of that section of the intelligentsia which seeks to use co-ops for advancement of the Socialist cause.

Prominent in this propaganda is the claim that there is great value in the cooperative practice of allotting control of co-ops on the basis of membership rather than on property interest; the slogan is, "Democratic control—one member, one vote."

Let us examine this method. Owner of one share of stock in a cooperative has one vote; owner of ten shares also has one vote. This writer will not contest the claim that the method is democratic, but will insist that it is not *American*.

Let us assume that three farmers undertake to do some hauling for a lumber company. Brown has six horses and Smith and Jones have two horses each. Under the American system, of each ten dollars of payment by the logging company for services, Brown would get six dollars and Smith and Jones would get two dollars each, and in bargaining with the logging company, the owner of the six horses would have a controlling voice.

Now let us assume that the three farmers have no

horses, but that Brown has savings which will enable him to purchase six horses, and Smith and Jones can buy two horses each. Now the three men organize a cooperative and put their funds into its treasury and the horses are purchased by the co-op, which also makes the deal with the logging firm.

Under this setup, the earnings will be divided as before, but when it comes to bargaining arrangements, the two owners of stock equivalent to the value of four horses can out-vote the owner of stock equivalent to the value of six horses.

This does not sound like an American plan, and why should it? The cooperative idea was developed in Europe. If Americans wish to adopt European ideas and use them in conduct of their business affairs, that is their privilege, but the use of European ideas by Americans does not convert them into American ideas.

Everett R. Clinchy, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is author of the leaflet, *Education and Human Relations*. In this booklet is developed one of the wierdest economic theories that this present writer ever has seen. "Believe it or not," the theory is:

There is a high correlation between depressions and areas of hate. . . . Hate of class, race, creed or nationality measurably slows up the solution of every economic problem.

According to this theory we must assume that the depression of the early 1930's came because some people were hating other people! Well, before the depression had been conquered, we were urged to hate Nazis and Japs so much that we would start shooting them. And hardly had the shooting started when the

depression was over—everybody who wanted to work had a job! How about it?

Of course no true American approves a doctrine of hate of other races, nationalities or creeds, but nothing is to be gained by advocating doctrines of maudlinism.

Nor does an American citizen who is devoted to the American idea of the importance and dignity of the individual toy with the philosophy of Socialism, which robs the citizen of his most important rights as an individual, including the right to own property and to care for his family from the fruits of his own toil.

What must we think, then, of leaders of National Education Association who choose the nation's shrewdest and most "slippery" propagandists for Socialism to prepare the content of Personal Growth Leaflets?

NEA recommends that these leaflets be "given to individual students to help maintain our common American heritage." NEA suggests that city and county superintendents of schools, principals of schools and presidents of colleges, use them as gifts to teachers and graduates. NEA further recommends that the leaflets be used by guidance and personnel workers for developing character and qualities of leadership, and that pastors and character building agencies should use them to guide the young. They are suitable also, NEA says, for libraries to use in programs for building good will among patrons.

Stuart Chase wrote *An American Program of Plenty* for publication as PGL No. 153, of which a total of 295,000 copies have been printed. In this leaflet the author's thesis is the same as it was in his book, *An Economy of Abundance*, the Macmillan Company, 1934, in which he presented the Socialist program in frank terms, even to accepting the basic

Marxian premise that the fall of capitalism is inevitable, for he wrote, "The ultimate decay of capitalism, prophesied by Marx, is now going on before our eyes."

Can any reader assume that the editors of Personal Growth Leaflets did not know about Stuart Chase's writings, and that he is one of those propagandists for Socialism who are frank when it pleases, and double-talkers when this tactic seems likely to be more effective?

Writing for the PGL booklet, Chase presents the Socialist propaganda techniques of arguing for "production for use" and for the program of gradualism with the mixed economy as the first goal. He wrote:

If production men are not thwarted by the exigencies of buying cheap and selling dear, if their only goal is production, they can make the plant jump over the moon. . . . We are, I think, heading deeper into a mixed economy, where government takes the responsibility of over-all leadership for full employment, but where business, co-operatives, and nonprofit enterprise—all share the field.

Another frankly Socialist writer, David Cushman Coyle, wrote three PGL booklets, *Economic Systems in the United States*, *A Primer of Taxation*, and *Roads to American Prosperity*, as Nos. 94, 93 and 97, respectively. Only the first-named has been promoted by the publishers; a total of 255,000 copies has been printed, as compared to no more than 30,000 for either of the others.

Coyle is touted by the NEA editors as a "noted engineer and author." Four of his books are named; the best known are *Brass Tacks*, 1935, and *Uncommon Sense*, 1936. Also it is noted that Coyle wrote the

\$1,000 Harper prize essay. This sounds very nice, the only "fly in the ointment" being that those who read the \$1,000 essay found in it nothing that could not be found also in any ten-cent pamphlet bearing the imprint of the Socialist Party.

Presumably in support of the theory that a mixed economy is at hand, the Coyle *Economic Systems* leaflet declares that six different economic systems now are operating in the United States. These systems are named as the operations of non-profit organizations such as churches, country clubs, foundations, colleges and professional societies; cooperatives; privately operated business enterprises; public utilities; government business, and criminal gangs which "form an economic system that supplies certain services desired by a large section of the public but not sanctioned by law."

Of course the truth is that only one economic system is operating in America. We had a competitive free enterprise system at the outset, and though this system has been modified in many respects, always in the direction of a collectivist system, it remains a competitive system with but minor exceptions.

For example, a non-profit society or cooperative, or the government, offering an insurance, food supply, hospital, or other service, must do so in competition with privately-owned, profit-seeking agencies offering the same or similar and competing services. Exceptions include monopolies given to such agencies as labor unions and public utilities by government, and government's own monopolies such as first class mail service.

In *Roads to American Prosperity*, circulation only 20,000 copies, Mr. Coyle offers this "appealing" bit:

A part of our personal savings . . . are not legitimate, but arise from failure to pay the full

cost of maintaining this country in good shape.

By paying income taxes for conservation and improvements, we can return idle savings to circulation, without creating any debts. At the same time we shall add to our wealth and security. And this is the most legitimate use of our savings.

Surely it is not surprising that NEA has not promoted the sale of this leaflet; how many will agree that our income tax payments are our best savings?

John Dewey's *My Pedagogic Creed* was made the subject of a separate chapter of this little book, titled "John Dewey's Philosophy In a Nutshell," because that leaflet offers the basis for the so-called progressive education. Dewey's over-all philosophy is sketched briefly, but quite understandably, in PGL No. 148, *The Task Before Us*. Quoting:

Since my adult years have been given to the pursuit of philosophy, I shall ask your indulgence if, in concluding, I state briefly the democratic faith in the formal terms of a philosophic position. So stated, democracy is belief in the ability of human experience to generate the aims and methods by which further experience will grow in ordered richness. Every other form of moral and social faith rests upon the idea that experience must be subjected at some point or other to some form of external control; to some "authority" alleged to exist outside the processes of experience. Democracy is the faith that the process of experience is more important than any special result attained, so that special results achieved are of ultimate value only as they are used to enrich and order the ongoing process.

In his statement Dr. Dewey has given us a defini-

tion of democracy as it is understood by him and his followers; we have every right to assume that when they talk or write about democracy, they have in mind the Dewey definition.

Examining the Dewey definition we find that democracy, as he conceives it, rejects all "‘authority’ . . . outside the processes of experience." Under this concept, nothing is true, nothing is good, and no course of human action is correct because of divine decree, nor are there any eternal verities, things good and things true, yesterday, today, tomorrow and forever. Hence, the future is what mankind, alone and unaided, will contrive to make it, with only man's own experience for a guide.

Out of the window go the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount; human actions are to be guided only by human judgment based on human experience as to the value to human comfort which will result, and as they may be used to "enrich and order the ongoing process."

Since Dr. Dewey has defined democracy in this fashion, it hardly will be consistent for his followers, presently dictating the policies of National Education Association, to object when others define democracy as a godless system, a rule of men rather than a government by law, as is done in the chapter of this little book entitled "NEA's Preoccupation with Democracy."

Openly and callously, or by subterfuge if this technique suits their mood, the Dewey followers attempt, at times, to bedeck their godless philosophy in the garments of religion, even in the vestments of the Christian faith.

This is a well understood propaganda tactic. It is described by A. Campbell Garnett of the philosophy department in the University of Wisconsin in his book,

A Realistic Philosophy of Religion, Willett, Clark & Company, 1942, as follows:

Thus we have, in the past hundred years, a new phenomenon in the history of civilization—a crusade against all religion carried on in the name of morality. In Europe the great revolutionary originator of this crusade was Karl Marx. In America it has been vigorously prosecuted in the interests of a much milder program of reforms by John Dewey.

Readers are unlikely to overlook the significance of the fact that Dr. Garnett sees two social-economic programs, but only one crusade.

An excellent example of use of the "cover up" is found in the presentation of *The Tenth Generation*, by Harry Stillwell Edwards, as Personal Growth Leaflet No. 11, and as a featured article in *The American Citizens Handbook*. Really a short story, *The Tenth Generation* was first published in *The Journal* of NEA in 1933. In both current publications an introduction declares that "Our American democratic civilization has its roots in religious teachings—in the brotherhood of man and the Golden Rule." The writing "belongs in the library of every teacher and every citizen," the blurb declares.

In the story a wise old attorney is consulted by a man of wealth who wants to know how he can arrange economic security for a prospective descendant in the tenth generation, perhaps about the year 2187.

The old lawyer draws some simple charts which show the questioner that the lad of 2187 will have 1,034 ancestors of this present generation, and these now are all around the questioning man and his young son.

The best insurance for the welfare of that boy of the future would be Christian education for the generation of today and the succeeding generations, the attorney argues, and the capitalist really "goes for" the idea, and is quoted as declaring:

"Ten generations of God-loving beings, sound of mind, body and soul, and full of the beauty of holiness, would give us back Jesus Christ on earth! And that is just the way He will come—the product of His own laws. Any other way would be illogical."

To millions of American men and women, Christian education means instruction in the teachings of the Holy Bible in a manner to encourage belief in those teachings. In the Scriptures it is written that Christ will return to earth when the prophesies of that Holy Writ have been fulfilled and the time of the Second Coming arrives.

Just why National Education Association should feel it necessary or even desirable to slap these earnest Christians in the face with declaration of a "second coming" doctrine which they must feel is purely secular and completely apostate and heretical surely passes all understanding. Though we have plenty of proof that the designs of the leaders are anti-God, anti-Christian and anti-American, it would seem that even this unholy cause could be forwarded in less revolting ways.

Perhaps the observation may seem anti-climactic, but surely it is worthy of note that the same group of men which insists that Christian teachings must not be presented in the public schools make a particular point of presenting a doctrine which millions declare is anti-Christian; and it is done as an example of Christian teaching!

IV

"BUILDING AMERICA"

No single project of National Education Association, or any of its divisions or departments, more certainly types the nation's greatest organization of educators as contributing to the cause of Communism-Socialism, than sponsorship of the textbooks *Building America*.

No textbook in any land ever had such unusual "birth," sponsorship and form of presentation.

"*Building America* was born in a Federal Writers' Project in New York City," it is quite correctly declared in *A Bill of Grievances*, prepared and published by National Society Sons of the American Revolution. "The first unit, 'Housing,' was prepared under the supervision of the Works Progress Administration."

But the project quickly attracted other sponsors. The first unit was published by The Society for Curriculum Study and distributed by Columbia University Press. This was a preliminary number.

Starting in October, 1935, and for five years thereafter, *Building America* units were published monthly for eight months each year. The units were 28 to 32 pages in size; the pages measured approximately nine by twelve inches. Each unit dealt with one subject. Second class mailing privileges were secured in April, 1936.

The second unit, *Food*, was designated as Vol. 1, No. 1, and on the back cover page of this issue it was announced that "*Building America* is published with

the assistance of Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University, and the Works Progress Administration, New York." The same legend appears on all issues of the 1935-1936 series, No. 1 to No. 8, inclusive, and these eight units and the preliminary "Housing" unit were bound in a volume bearing on the front cover the inscription, "Illustrated Studies of

All 32 issues or units of the four years or volumes Modern Problems."

starting with October, 1936, bear the imprint of E. M. Hale and Company, Milwaukee, Wis., as publisher, and in the set available to this writer, the three volumes, Nos. 2, 3 and 4, the Hale company name appears on the binding and on the preliminary pages giving table of contents and other information about the book as a whole.

Volume 5 of this set bears the imprint of the Americana Corporation, New York, on the binding and preliminary pages. All units and volumes show that the copyright is owned by the Society for Curriculum Study.

At the time of these original printings and publications of *Building America* the Society for Curriculum Study was an independent organization, not directly affiliated with National Education Association, though closely allied in matters of methods, programs and personnel. The situation existed from 1924, when the Society was founded, until the "merger" in 1943. This background is detailed in various NEA publications, as, for example, we read in *Proceedings* of the eighty-seventh annual meeting held at Boston, Mass., 1949:

The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction had its inception as an independent society called the National Conference on Educational Method, organized in February, 1921.

. . . At the Boston meeting of the NEA in February, 1928, the name of the society was changed to the National Conference of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, and the executive committee was instructed to prepare a petition asking for acceptance as an NEA department. The petition was acted upon favorably at the Minneapolis meeting in July, 1929.

On March 1, 1943, the department merged with the Society for Curriculum Study, founded in 1924, and changed the name of the organization to the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development. On January 1, 1946, the title was changed by substituting the word "Association" for "Department."

Thus NEA "absorbed" the Society for Curriculum Study and its programs and projects, most notable of which is *Building America*.

Public housing projects in England, France, Germany, Russia and Austria are lauded in the preliminary "Housing" unit of *Building America*. Nothing America has done in the way of housing in any way compares with these overseas housing projects; America's timid approach to public housing, however, has one thing in its favor, the unit authors believe—no public housing project ever could fail.

In black-faced type, the unit authors present a "comparison," which is an implied question, with no answer given. It is pointed out that since 1911, an automobile manufacturer has added many improvements to his product, and at the same time reduced the price to about one-third the 1911 figure, while the cost of residential housing has about doubled.

The "Food" unit approves all the New Deal programs for agriculture, including the Tugwell Bill which

failed of passage, and gives the reader the impression that only through intervention of government agencies can the nation hope to escape suffering, if not outright starvation.

In this unit *Building America* breaks a well-established policy of textbook writing by expressing an editorial viewpoint, repeated in many later units, as follows:

Building America believes that the American people have so far mastered the forces of nature that, for the first time in history, we can now live in an age of plenty for all. We may thus, at last, have abundance and leisure to develop the finest possible American culture.

The "Health" unit offers an excellent presentation, in picture and story, of development of medical science and public health, but the final pages are strongly slanted toward socialized medicine.

That government intervention and control is the only hope for continued free movement of persons and goods is the principal theme of the "Transportation" unit.

Again, in the "Communication" unit of Volume 1, a fine presentation of development in the various fields occupied by private enterprisers is "thrown out of focus" by exaggerated distortion of the merits of the sole government-operated enterprise, the post office, which offers the public a "service (which) is cheap, safe and efficient, and more widespread than that of these means of instant communication," meaning telegraph, telephone and radio.

Repeating, in the "Power" unit, the authors fairly present developments of electric power, all the result of efforts of individuals and corporations, and the

claims of Rural Electrification Administration are accepted only in part by the authors. But government operation in the electric power field through such projects as Boulder Dam and Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and locally through municipally-owned utilities, wins hundred per cent approval of the authors.

At the outset it is declared that "electricity is a public utility, as necessary to modern life as water and shelter," a fallacy so obvious as to need no discussion.

"The Federal Government is making cheap power by building dams and hydroelectric plants," the authors declare, and in "proof" offer the completely discredited statistics and arguments of proponents of TVA and other public power projects.

Over-all plans of the planners of public power are disclosed in a map on Page 26 of the "Power" unit. "The map shows how America might plan a nationwide system for producing and distributing electric power," lines under it explain. The map is credited to National Resources Board, Mississippi Valley Committee, and titled "Tentative Regional Power Districts for the U. S." The 12 districts shown blanket the entire nation.

Similar maps have been shown in connection with plans drafted by the Public Ownership League, headed by Carl D. Thompson, who left the Socialist Party to work for "gradual socialization." Following a Super-Power Conference held in Washington, D. C., in January, 1924, Senator George W. Norris offered the Conference plan in a bill (S-2790, 68th Congress, First Session) which provided for "a nation-wide super-power system."

This bill failed of passage, but Senator Norris bided his time, and in 1933 offered the bill which established Tennessee Valley Authority as first unit of a scheme to

spread the Authority plan over every acre of the area of the United States.

In the "Recreation" unit, as in all others of this volume, government "has the answer" to all the problems arising from the desires of people for recreation, quite as well as other needs and desires of the general public.

Unquestionably, youth faced many problems during the depression years of the early 1930's, but many critics claim these problems were unduly emphasized in No. 8, the final unit of Volume 1, titled "Youth Faces the World."

If pictures can be believed—and surely *photographs* cannot deceive—the youth of the Soviets and even in Nazi Germany were healthier and happier, better clothed, better fed, and better behaved than our American youth during those troublous days.

German girls in a labor camp present a much more pleasing picture, as they are shown in this unit of *Building America*, than do the young Americans in a Civilian Conservation Corps camp. Other "unflattering" photos of American youth show two groups stealing rides on freight cars; one group of young loafers outside a sporting goods store; another group being questioned by police officers; soldiers under fire; students demonstrating for "Schools, Not Battleships"; a doleful and dispirited group seeking solace in a rather gloomy library, and one rather intelligent looking youth whose only view is through prison bars.

Of course government is doing its best for young people; the young readers of *Building America* are told of the programs of National Youth Administration, Federal Employment Service, Works Progress Administration and CCC, but the young people engaged in projects arranged by such agencies, or even

the Y.M.C.A. and similar agencies, do not appear happy as they are pictured in this book.

Nor are all these things enough—youth must “organize for peace” and take part in such ventures as the Student Strike Against War sponsored annually by the American Student Union. The National Student Federation also is a worthy organization, readers of *Building America* are advised.

According to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, National Student Federation was closely interlocked with the (subversive) American Student Union, of which it was a predecessor. (Page 471 of *Appendix IX* of the House Committee.) *Building America* recommends the NSF to secondary school students who may be going to college soon.

American Youth Congress, as it operated from 1934 to 1941, “was one of the most influential front organizations ever set up by the Communists in this country,” the House Committee declared on Page 525 of *Appendix IX*. Originally organized by a non-Communist, Viola Ilma, the Congress was taken over by Communist infiltration prior to the end of 1934, it is explained on Page 526 of the *Appendix*. The job was accomplished neatly and with dispatch under direction of leaders of the Young Communist League.

Thus we see that in May, 1936, a year and a half after American Youth Congress began operating as a Communist front, it is presented to adolescents in secondary schools as a worthy organization engaged in a worthy program.

In the years following completion of the original five-volume series of *Building America* much of the content was revised and rearranged.

Building America was adopted as a supplementary text for Seventh and Eighth Grades of California

schools by the State Board of Education in January, 1947. The matter was not allowed to rest there; the Senate Investigating Committee on Education devoted its Third Report, dated March 27, 1948, to presentation of its procedures and findings in connection with its investigation of charges that *Building America* is unsuitable for use in public schools. The finding, Page 19, is summarized in the following paragraph:

The Committee finds the *Building America* Books to be unfit for use in our schools, and appends hereto independent appraisals of the books and a record of the official actions to date.

At the time of this investigation, which was four years after the Society for Curriculum Study had been absorbed into the National Education Association, the current edition of *Building America* was in thirty "volumes," the volumes corresponding to the units of the bound volumes.

The Senate Investigating Committee retained Atty. R. E. Combs, for ten years counsel for the various committees of the Legislature mandated to investigate subversive activities, to make critical analysis of the thirty volumes. His report, which includes considerable material about the affiliations, backgrounds and writings of contributors to *Building America* and authors whose texts are listed in the bibliographies, is presented in the final 65 pages of the Committee Report.

In the introduction or letter of submission, Mr. Combs wrote in part:

I have checked the text material, illustrations and captions. . . . Some of the booklets contain no Communist propaganda. Others contain it in

abundance. The majority of the books are slanted in such a manner that they pointedly disparage the American way of life by criticizing the defects and failing to devote commensurate attention to the benefits. In many instances the text material is erroneous. Frequently the most insidious and effective propaganda is accomplished through illustrations and captions.

Volume XXX, titled "Seeing America," is described by Mr. Combs as "the last, and certainly one of the worst books in the series." From his description it appears to be identical with the unit of the same title which appears as Unit No. 8 in Volume 3 of the first printing.

As Mr. Combs points out, if the student, or other reader, expects that the book will give him an accurate picture of a progressive, prosperous and independent America, he will be disappointed.

The book is illustrated with 55 reproductions of photographs, but they are not pictures taken by some person or group making a tour of America. The pictures are "stock" photos secured from various agencies. Somebody picked up the pictures, then the "story" was written around them.

Twenty-two of the photographs were secured from the Farm Security Administration; two from other federal agencies; eight from one professional photographer and four from others in the same business; two from aerial surveys; three from two Chambers of Commerce; three from two state departments of conservation; two from automobile manufacturers; four from as many railroads, and the remainder from miscellaneous sources. Only one was taken for *Building America*, and that is a picture of a New York skyscraper.

Of the pictures collected for this unit, "Seeing America," not one shows a church or library or a school, or a local or national park; not a picture shows a national monument, or a forest, rippling stream or plunging waterfall. There is no picture of a residential street, or of a college campus; no picture of either youth or adults at play save only one group of picnickers in a Tennessee state picnic ground, and some sun bathers and sea bathers at a Florida resort.

One Idaho farmstead is pictured, and it looks fairly "nice," though the buildings, mostly hidden by trees, appear uninviting. A Wisconsin farm scene shows shed-like barns and no silo! Other farm scenes show Negro workers weighing in their cotton pick; a mule auction on an Illinois farm; a cantaloupe field in the Imperial Valley; a farmer viewing an eroded field; a flooded farm bordered by a river dike; an abandoned farmstead in New York state; a family of refugees from a drought area, a row of barbeque stands and tourist camps along a treeless highway, and a western reclamation project.

Urban scenes include a picture of a jobless man standing in front of a vacant store; one of the Farm Security Administration pictures; a horse-drawn water-wagon largely obscuring a two-story business block; a group of men visiting and "loafing" on a courthouse lawn on a Saturday afternoon; Main street in Macon, Ga.; main streets of Salt Lake City, Utah, and a small nameless village in a treeless area of the plains; Negro section of a Southern town; a Southern steel mill with homes of workers in foreground; Southern mine tipples, again with homes of workers in the foreground, and the wreckage left by a Southern hurricane.

Surely the foregoing list of pictures gives a sorry

picture of our beloved America, most prosperous nation in the world.

For the purpose of describing America, textually, *Building America* authors divide the country into five sections or divisions, and devote two double-page "spreads" to each. In the brief resume which follows, captions of the pages are given, pair by pair, in italic type.

The East—Early Settlers Found a Land of Plenty. The theme is that we now have *The East—Greatest Industrial Region of America* because of the great natural resources of iron, coal, oil and forests, and the geographical advantages of rivers and harbors.

The South—Goodliest Soil Under Heaven. Here, too, were rich natural resources, making possible *The South—A Great Agricultural and Rising Industrial Region.*

The Middle West—Land of Forests and Prairies. Starting with a rich fur trade and developing the greatest deposit of iron ore in the world, and other valuable minerals in plenty, we now have *The Middle West—Region of Farms and Factories.*

The West—Land of Plains and Mountains. Fur traders, trappers, government agents and other fearless souls such as the Mormons, pressed westward to the land of the richest silver and copper deposits, displaced the buffalo with sheep, and with the kindly aid of the Department of Reclamation, wrested some 11,000,000 acres from the deserts; the descendants of these pioneers now reside in *The West—Mining and Grazing Region.*

The Far West—Golden Land. Great Britain and the United States were rival claimants for the "Oregon country," but America won out and the area is included in a land of forestry, mining and pleasant cli-

mactic conditions, productive fisheries, a lot of irrigation projects (government sponsored, of course) and water powers developed (also at taxpayer expense) at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. So why should it not be *The Far West—Region of Varied Industries?*

But America is not so much a land of production, performance and accomplishment as it is a land of problems and possibilities. Hence a double page "spread" devoted to discussion of the sorry fact that *Americans Still Face Nature-Made Problems*, these problems being mainly floods, forest fires and erosion.

Again we learn, in another "spread," that *Man-Made Problems Also Confront Our People*. These problems are "overcrowding, unemployment, poor or insufficient farmland, and great inequalities in the distribution of wealth and income." But there is hope!

In the last "spread" the reader is privileged to be *Seeing America—As It Might Be*. The authors tell the juvenile readers that "America is a country rich in natural and man-made resources, yet one-third of our people are said to be ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed." But government will solve all the problems:

Already Americans have begun to take steps to make over our country into a better place of living, for all the people. Local communities have more and more worked out city plans for rehousing slum dwellers, for adding parks and playgrounds, for building new schools. State governments have started programs to conserve their soil, forests and wild life. The Federal Government, through its Natural Resources Committee, has worked out plans for developing more wisely the natural and human resources of our great nation.

Another "volume" sharply criticized by Attorney Combs in his official capacity is titled "Our Constitution"; it is Volume I of the edition at his disposal. The title is the same as that of Unit I of Volume 2 of the original bound edition, but this seems to be a case of revision, and perhaps re-revision of the original, and withall, revision for the worse. Many of the pictures and statements which the attorney criticizes do not appear in the first printing.

One of the historical cartoons criticized by the attorney shows Thomas Jefferson attempting to pull down the Federal Government, with the enthusiastic assistance of the Devil. The caption admits that such a cartoon "would offend public taste today," and offers no reason for "unearthing" it for consideration of adolescents of this era. Another cartoon shows "Lincoln, Sumner and Greeley burying the Constitution, Free Speech, the Habeas Corpus and the Union," each of the latter shown in separate caskets. Quoting Attorney Combs:

On page 244 appears a picture of downtrodden workers supporting on their bowed shoulders the nation's industries, and seated on top of the heap are the capitalists—fat, opulent and wearing silk hats. . . .

On page 246 a group of roughly-clad and angry factory workers are shown gathered around the front porch of their employer. A sad-looking lady stands nearby with a babe in her arms and a little girl at her side. The workers are demanding more pay and better working conditions, and the owner of the factories looks coldly down at them from under his silk hat, while a servant in livery stands behind his master. . . .

On page 251 a police patrol car is about to

depart for the nearest jail with a load of draft slackers. The usual curious crowd is milling around. The caption states: "Police (above) are arresting men who cannot prove they have registered for the draft of 1917. Public temper ran so high that many 'slackers' were denied their constitutional rights."

On page 252 are two illustrations. The first shows a breadline; the second a run on a bank. These indicate to the grammar school children how "A Depression Tests the Strength of the Constitution."

The text material in this book has been criticized on the ground that it is, in many instances, historically and technically inaccurate. It is submitted that the 8th graders for whom this particular volume was intended would not be bothered too much about the interpretation of legal matters by the Supreme Court. . . .

Much of the text material in this book is most certainly not subversive in the sense that it advocates the overthrow of the Government by unlawful means. The text does create the impression that the Constitution may be outmoded and has been stretched and pulled out of shape to cover a social era not contemplated when the document was drawn. There are pointed suggestions that despite Constitutional safeguards, civil liberties have been violated, monopolies encouraged and that the toiling masses have been pretty much at the mercy of the corpulent gentlemen in silk hats. These general impressions are created through the vague and confusing language of the text and by the plainly biased nature of the illustrations. No fair person wants such a supplementary text to present a distorted picture of our Constitutional form of government; no such person believes that

our government has been perfect—but to emphasize the defects and minimize the virtues as this book does is too much.

None of the pictures or cartoons mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs from Attorney Combs' report appear in the original printing. The most objectionable pictures in the earlier printing show the burning of Elijah Lovejoy's printing establishment, men in the costumes of the Black Legion, and a Chicago scene during the Haymarket Riot in 1886.

These pictures, with accompanying text, tend to lead the young reader to believe that, by and large, the Bill of Rights has not done much of anything to protect American citizens. The authors come close to saying just that under a picture showing Norman Thomas addressing a really tremendous crowd in New York City. The description of the picture reads in part:

Socialists such as Thomas, Communists, and trade union leaders have many times been denied the right to freedom of speech in certain American towns and cities, a violation of their Constitutional rights.

"Many times" is most indefinite terminology, and likely to deceive. Probably, if computation were made, it would be found that millions of meetings of radicals and trade unionists have been held, with no interference of any kind, for every one which was prohibited or interfered with by local ordinance, or illegal acts of officials or private persons or groups.

While the text, like the pictures, is different in the two printings, Attorney Combs' criticism fits both cases remarkably well. In the first printing, a major portion of the text on ten pages (of a total of 28 pages

in the unit) has to do with controversies about Supreme Court decisions.

A news feature from *The New York Times* under caption, "Court's New Deal Score," shows how the court and its individual members "lined up" on ten pieces of New Deal legislation. (Of the ten, only the TVA Act and the Gold Clause Act won approval.)

The young readers are asked whether they agree with the decisions of the court!

Throughout the "Constitution" unit there is bland assurance that everything done by the New Deal, and prior to that period, everything done in the name of "democracy," was most certainly for the best, and wholly above any possible criticism. The "best efforts" of the authors to cover their bias by statements to the effect that "liberals" argue so-and-so, and conservatives take this-and-that position, are completely unsuccessful.

A strangely-conceived contradiction of terms occurs in a statement on Page 12: "On the whole, the twenty-one amendments to the Constitution have not changed the form of government, but have helped to make our government more democratic than it was before."

It may not be admitted by the authors of *Building America*, but the Founders of our government recognized that a democracy and a republic are quite different *forms* of government, and deliberately chose to establish a republic, rejecting all pleas for creation of a democracy.

When for example, by amendment of our federal Constitution, we adopted direct election of U. S. Senators, and when, by amendment of state Constitutions, the democratic techniques of referendum, initiative and recall came into use, the *form* of American gov-

ernment was changed, to some degree, in the direction of democracy.

The *Building America* authors write what purports to be a statement of the background and operations of the convention at which our Constitution was written, but in that account there is no word about the most important issue which was discussed and decided there, which was the matter of the *form* the new government was to take.

Their sin is not merely a sin of omission, for on Page 27, last page of text, they make the direct and flat statement, "this is a democracy."

To the mind of this writer, even such a statement as that just quoted is less evil than the authors' participation in the Communist-inspired plot to besmirch and besmear the writers of the Constitution and that document, and the government it founded. They wrote, and their writing appears on Page 7:

The Convention held together "by the strength of a hair" only because the delegates were agreed upon at least one main point. They wanted a strong government to protect property against "the common man" who owned little more than the strength of his hands.

After relating a sad story about how sweatshops despoil and exploit workers despite all the efforts of the two great unions, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the authors make strong inferences that retail shops have too high a mark-up on their wares. They follow through by making it appear that citizens of America either are poorly clothed, or "robbed" when they buy clothing, but happily the *Building America* authors come up with a "solution"

in the "Clothing" Unit, No. 3 of Volume 2 of the original printing. The solution:

What we must do is to plan our clothing industry. There must be less "cut-throat" competition between rival companies, and reasonable prices for goods so that owners get a reasonable profit on their money. There must be higher wages for workers in the clothing industry so that they can buy clothing and other goods they need. There must be shorter hours of work so that more clothing workers have jobs. All Americans must learn how to spend their clothing dollars more wisely. And the incomes of millions of our families must be raised to a level where they can purchase adequate clothing.

The authors do not say who is to "plan," and who is to make the plans work, but we may be sure the readers, even the adolescents, know what the authors have in mind.

As might be expected, the employing steel companies get none of the best of it when the *Building America* authors describe the Homestead strike of 1892 with pictures and text in the "Steel" unit, No. 5 of Volume 2 of the original printing. The authors have a "plan" for bettering conditions in the industry. It is on Page 31 of the unit, and reads:

If the steel industry were to run at full blast night and day turning out steel products, they would be able to manufacture materials which Americans very much need. They could, for example, make steel houses like that pictured opposite. If these houses were made cheaply enough, they would help provide better homes for millions of American families.

We may wonder what came into the minds of youngsters who happened to be assigned to this section of "learning" materials at the time when the newspapers told citizens of the Lustron fiasco.

With such a mass of material to examine—more than 50 non-duplicated units in the first and latest printings—this chapter could be expanded almost indefinitely. Mr. Combs found that of the 30 volumes in the printing he examined, about half were free of collectivist propaganda, or nearly so. In many cases he noted that it did not appear that the subject lent itself to introduction of propaganda.

Certainly this did not apply to the unit or volume on "Russia," which is included in the last, but not the first printing. Here was opportunity to glorify the Soviet Union, and the authors did not fail to seize the advantage.

This unit is profusely illustrated, as are all other units, and every photograph used was supplied by Sovphoto, official Soviet propaganda agency. Naturally, the Soviet agency is able to make the Soviets appear to be a land of happy, friendly and exceptionally prosperous people.

By way of excusing this one-sided, completely unrealistic presentation, the Americana Corporation, publishers, explained that surely "everyone is aware" that it is impossible to secure photographs to portray adequately the squalor, destitution and misery—Soviet inflicted—which would have to be shown if the Soviets were correctly pictured.

But nowhere in the text is this pointed out! Will the children, pupils of the Seventh and Eighth grades, know it, instinctively?

This "sin of omission" appears in other ways in the text. Nowhere in the volume is there any mention

of concentration camps, purge trials, secret police or party discipline; there is no mention of the Third International or Comintern, which is the very heart and soul of the international Marxism.

Young Pioneers are pictured on a hike, and the reader learns that the Pioneers graduate into the Komsomols, but they are not told that both Pioneers and Komsomols are party-controlled organizations, and that the primary purpose of both is to indoctrinate Russian youth with the Marxian ideology.

Russian people are pictured going to church, but the young Americans who are to "learn" from the books are not told that these "open" churches are "show places" and strictly Communist controlled to the end that no such thing as freedom of religion exists in the Soviets.

This unit or volume is completely "bad"; if it were the only objectionable feature of the entire *Building America* Series, it would be sufficient cause for rejection of the whole.

National Education Association must accept responsibility for *Building America*; it was "adopted" by NEA when the Society for Curriculum Study was "absorbed," years after all educators had had ample opportunity to know that the series was unfit for use by American public schools.

V

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION "EXPOSES"
PROPAGANDA

Protection of youth from evil propaganda is one of the professed objectives of all progressive educators.

Under direction of Prof. Elmer Ellis of the Department of History, University of Missouri, the National Council for the Social Studies devoted its Seventh *Yearbook* to explanation of how best to do it. The *Yearbook* was presented under the title *Education Against Propaganda*. Professor Ellis, at that time (1937) president of the Council, was editor of the *Yearbook*.

Sixteen articles by as many writers are included in the *Yearbook*, and Editor Ellis explains in his Introduction that the first eight articles "were planned by the editor to acquaint teachers with basic concepts," and the remainder were selected as "examples of good practice and theory at present available for use in the schools."

Along the line of "basic concepts" for teachers, it is interesting to note that Prof. Hadley Cantril, of Princeton University, in the article "Propaganda and the Radio," chooses W. J. Cameron, speaker on the Ford Sunday Evening Hour, as the outstanding propagandist for the evil influences of entrenched wealth. Starting on Page 93 we read:

We may select as an example of this type of propaganda the talks given by W. J. Cameron on

the Ford Sunday Evening Hour. The program comes at an hour when families are gathered together in their homes. It is a dignified, respectable program consisting of comparatively high-class music. The dignity of the music is sustained by the dignity and authority of Mr. Cameron's voice. His talks cover an enormous range of subjects. But except when he is uttering a series of harmless platitudes on such a subject as "The Light of Easter," or "Mother's Day," one may read into his remarks two consistent themes: the greatness of Mr. Ford and the warning that any tampering with our present system of economic individualism will spell disaster. A few of Mr. Cameron's statements will illustrate the point.

.. .
 In his address on "The Constitution" we read: "The peculiar glory of the Constitution of the United States is that it is not a charter of rights granted by the government to the people, but a limit of powers to which a vigilant people restricts its government." Obviously the liberal minority on the supreme court would rephrase this sentence to mean exactly the opposite.

Granted that a strong case could be made for characterizing Mr. Cameron as a propagandist of a type, certainly Professor Cantril did not make a particularly happy choice in his selection of an example of "reactionary" propaganda, for the simple reason that the statement ascribed to Mr. Cameron is absolutely true, and it cannot be presented as false even if all members of the Supreme Court and all the other judges and all the collectivist-minded persons in the world would like to rephrase it.

The American government is not an entity with divine right or any other right beyond the rights granted

to it by the citizens in whom sovereignty rests, and it has no power to grant liberties to anybody. The powers and authorities granted to the three branches of the American government when "We the people of the United States" adopted the Constitution are strictly limited, and "The Enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The last quoted phrases are the text of the Ninth and Tenth Articles of the Bill of Rights.

We can and should be grateful to Professor Cantril for showing us so plainly that he wishes to conceal from the citizens the true character of our government as one of the means of deceiving them into the belief that government can and does have the power to confer benefits, even liberties, upon its subjects. For this is the philosophy of all collectivism, and held by all collectivist-minded persons, whether they be Marxians, Fabians or merely deluded "liberals."

And it must not be overlooked that Professor Cantril is one of Professor Ellis' "chosen eight" who were commissioned to "acquaint teachers with basic concepts."

A much less particularized statement regarding the evil influences from which American students must be protected opens the tirade of Prof. Howard K. Beale of the University of North Carolina, who begins another of the "chosen eight" articles, titled "Propaganda Influences Within the School," as follows:

Various groups in the United States seek to control what is taught in the schools. Most vocal

among these, if not the most powerful, are the so-called patriotic groups. These fall into three types: military organizations like the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Reserve Officers' Association, which have taken the place of the now almost extinct Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans; ancestor-worshippers like the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the Sons of Veterans; and certain professional patriots organized to propagate "patriotism" of a 100 per cent variety through groups like the America First Foundation, the American Civic Association, the American Vigilant Intelligence Committee, the Better America Federation, the Key Men of America, the National Civic Federation, the National Security League, and the Paul Reverses.

These organizations have several common characteristics. They stand for a peculiar brand of chauvinism and supernationalism, for large armaments, imperialism, and isolationism, for reactionary social and economic views. . . . They fight "radicalism" in the name of ancestors who were themselves radicals. They seek to repress freedom in the name of ancestors whose chief claim to fame was their love of freedom. They claim to be protectors of American ideals and traditions but have never read the writings of men like Lincoln, Jefferson, Madison, Tom Paine, Franklin, Adams, and Washington sufficiently to know that they perpetually violate the ideas for which these men struggled. If Thomas Jefferson tried today in an American school to interpret the Declaration of Independence or his First Inaugural in terms of modern America, the patriotic organizations would have him barred as a "dan-

gerous radical." If any of our Revolutionary heroes tried to teach in an American school, the patrioteers would discover that, after all, in leading America into the Revolution, he had been in the employ of Soviet Russia.

Some readers, as well as this writer, are likely to believe that the real truth is just the opposite of Professor Beale's observations about reading. If the modern-day "educators" who teach our youth that the American government is a democracy had read extensively of the writings and sayings of the Founding Fathers, they might have read, even if they did not profit by, a rather typical reminiscence about Benjamin Franklin.

Franklin was approached, after adjournment of the Constitutional Convention, by a citizen who asked what type of government the country would have under the Constitution, if ratified. "A republic—if we can keep it," was Franklin's reply.

More about National Education Association's false teaching in this regard will be found in the chapter of this little book titled "NEA's Preoccupation with 'Democracy.'" So, before proceeding to examination of the professor's vagaries on other or related subjects, we pause only long enough to wonder how the professor can be so sure that Lincoln, Madison, Jefferson and the others, if living today, would have as little regard for the basic principles of American liberty as do the "educators" who determine the policies of NEA.

Professor Beale's paper is a "treasure trove" of rabid excoriation of all who refuse to follow the collectivist line, but only one more quotation will be made. It is from Pages 106 and 107 of the *Yearbook*:

Pressures upon teachers have greatly increased since the World War. . . . The pressure groups operate upon the teacher in a variety of ways. They influence politicians to enact legislation and school board regulations denying freedom; loyalty oath laws, usually harmless in themselves but dangerous because of the use that may be made of them and the purpose of their advocates; compulsory flag salutes; required celebrations of special days, anniversaries of events, even in one state an Uncle Remus Day; required courses in good citizenship, state history, the Federal Constitution, the state constitutions, and numerous other subjects often valuable in themselves but imposed by politicians at the behest of some interested group with no regard for the rounding out of a general curriculum based on sound educational principles; . . . Many of the specific curriculum requirements are objectionable not because offensive in themselves but merely because when they are piled up together they leave little chance to work out an effective educational program.

Surely no parent of a teen-age high school student, and no citizen desiring the best in education for the voters of tomorrow, can miss the implications of the foregoing quotation, penned by a writer who is impatient with any and all ideas in opposition to a free hand for collectivist-minded "educators" in conduct of the public schools.

But in case some social science teacher or other teacher who can believe no evil of the "superior minds" who determine NEA policies may read this, a few questions will be asked:

Will somebody please point out a few teachers who are not going about their duties, and their pleasures,

in the complete freedom which is the right of American citizens?

If it is true that loyalty oaths are harmless in themselves—and it is true, as can be testified by hundreds of thousands of elected and appointed public officials who have sworn to uphold the Constitution will testify—just what use can be made of them to harm these who take the oaths, or those who administer them, or anybody else?

Just what is wrong with teaching children to salute our National Emblem?

Why should we not celebrate, in schools and elsewhere, the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington, and perhaps other national heroes? Is it wrong to remember Armistice Day and Memorial Day?

Most important question of all: Will Professor Beale, or some other spokesman for NEA, tell us how a "general curriculum based on sound educational principles" can be "rounded out" for use in American schools, to instruct the next generation of American voters, without inclusion of studies of citizenship, state and national history, state and national Constitutions?

This observer, a newspaper man for a quarter-century and watching public affairs in some capacity or other, or merely as a citizen, for more than half a century, believes that demands for teaching American history and related subjects come from parents and patrons of the schools, rather than from politicians or "interests."

But regardless of their source, would these demands be made if these subjects were being satisfactorily taught, or even taught in mediocre fashion, in the public schools of the day?

Certainly, in the case of any school system where the teaching of these important subjects is being ac-

complished satisfactorily, either the demands will not arise, or they can be answered by a showing of what is being done. Certainly the answer never would need to be complaints because patrons, or anybody else, wanted these subjects taught in the schools.

From the "approved" paper of Professor Beale it is quite clear that the "educators" setting policies for NEA are eager to protect the youth of the land from the vicious "'patriotism' of a 100 per cent variety" disseminated by "ancestor worshippers."

Are they as eager to protect adolescent students from the propaganda on the left?

A "progressive education" technique which has the approval of Editor Elmer Ellis of the *Seventh Year-book* is the discussion method. Teen-agers in the "progressive" schools "study" by pitting their wits against the wiles of the shrewdest propagandists the world ever has seen.

"Teaching Resistance to Propaganda" is the title of a paper by Prof. William W. Biddle, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis., which is one of the papers which Editor Ellis presents as "examples of good practice and theory at present available for use in the schools." Professor Biddle goes directly to the point:

The more orthodox education sought to have children absorb given quantities of "correct" information. Newer tendencies stress the importance of self-motivation in the child, of his seeking through his own activities, research and discussion to discover truth for himself. An integral part of this newer "child-centered" education is the process of deliberation, by which students in groups examine many sources of information and

ideas and winnow out those ideas which impress them as tenable.

To "translate" this: the old fashioned educators assumed that before any person, youth or adult, can make rational decisions about social, economic or political questions, he must have some facts and information bearing on the subject. "Reactionary" teachers believe that some knowledge of economics is desirable before a person is requested to make up his mind about economic issues. Some knowledge of historical nature might be helpful, since an economist is likely to realize that what will happen under certain conditions probably will be quite like what has happened before under similar conditions.

But our "progressive" educators have a different idea. Presumably they argue that the only way to learn to swim is to swim. At any rate they think it proper and normal procedure to set teen-agers to discussing the merits of Supreme Court decisions, the probability that historical accounts of Revolutionary War battles are purely legendary or based in propaganda, and the solution of the most difficult economic problems.

The problem of unemployment is one which has occupied the attention of economists and other scholars for many years, and the wisest of these are the first to acknowledge that they do not have all the answers, nor do they really expect to have all the answers at any foreseeable or predictable future date.

Professor Biddle recommends setting a class of Eighth or Ninth Grade students at work to discover the causes and cure of unemployment, and describes in detail how it was done in a school not named.

At this time we are not so much interested in the

methods and propriety of the procedure as in the research materials used. Professor Biddle offers the list of points of view which were examined, as follows:

Monetary Theories: Father Coughlin, inflationism, John Maynard Keynes, social credit.

Theories Concerning the Automatic Passing of the Depression: Ex-President Hoover, the Liberty League, material from the Chamber of Commerce, Leonard Ayres.

Theories Demanding Fundamental Change: Foster and Catchings, Norman Thomas, Karl Marx, Communist leaflets, Stuart Chase, George Soule, Fascism in Italy and Germany, Technocracy, E.P.I.C., Unemployment Insurance.

Overproduction, Underconsumption and Miscellaneous: Farmers' organizations, the New Deal, Labor organizations, "America's Capacity to Produce," "America's Capacity to Consume," Tax schemes, "Share the Wealth."

Only on the point of the theory that the depression would pass automatically were any conservative materials examined. On all other phases of the problem, conservative or liberal materials were entirely lacking or clumsily concealed, and the students were "exposed to" the propaganda of every revolutionary, radical and crackpot movement active in the nation.

Techniques used, as well as the method of approach, so closely parallel those of the once-powerful Institute for Propaganda Analysis that it is not surprising to find in the book quoted above several references to the earlier writings of Prof. Clyde R. Miller of Columbia University, secretary of the Institute during its rather brief but altogether hectic existence.

Later manuals of NEA departments openly recom-

mend the Institute materials, as for example, three favorable references are to be found in *Teaching Critical Thinking in the Social Studies*, Thirteenth Yearbook of The National Council for the Social Studies, 1942, on Pages 20, 50 and 171.

Before that *Yearbook* made its initial bow, the Institute had passed out of the American scene, and the *Yearbook* sponsors were "left high and dry."

The Institute had been established in 1937 with funds provided by the late Edward A. Filene, Boston merchant with a penchant for support of leftist projects. Its demise was forecast as early as February, 1941, but it was not until December of that year—after Pearl Harbor—that the Institute "folded up," ostensibly for the duration, but remaining "in hibernation" to date of this writing.

Commenting upon the demise, *The Survey* for December, 1941, related that at a meeting of the board on the previous Feb. 27, "it was decided that if the U. S. became involved in hostilities, a re-examination of program would become necessary."

In its issue for June 9, 1941, *Time* reported that two members of the board had resigned, these being Prof. Paul H. Douglas of the University of Chicago (now United States Senator) and Prof. Eduard C. Lindeman of the New York School of Social Research, a former president of the Institute. Professor Lindeman was quoted as declaring that one of the Institute's articles about the war had in it "more propaganda than analysis."

Directors of the Institute, announcing "suspension for the duration," were quoted by *Christian Century*, Nov. 26, 1941, as saying that "after the war the Institute might resume its task of subjecting the conflicting claims of official and unofficial partisans to objective

analyses, but it is no longer possible to attempt that service in the midst of the conflict."

Prof. Kirtley Mather of Harvard University, Institute president at the time, was a bit more concise; he was quoted as saying that it was not advisable to examine the government's war propaganda.

Professor Lindeman's remark, quoted above, was made concerning only one article; it would have been equally correct if he had directed it at all the Institute's publications and pronouncements.

From the outset the Institute had rejected the definitions of outstanding authorities, such as Prof. Frederick E. Lumley of Ohio State University,* and held that there is such a thing as good propaganda. The Institute's ideas about good propaganda were a matter of no little concern to many who observed the Institute's operation, for it seemed that in its analyses of propagandas—and it was only bad propaganda that it attempted to analyze—the Institute never got around to analyzing the propaganda of the Communists and other leftists.

The only possible conclusion was that the Institute viewed as good all the propaganda of the leftists. Direct charge to this effect was made in a letter to Professor Miller under date of July 10, 1938, and over the signature of this present writer.

A statement of general denial would have been easy to make, and were the charge not true, it should have been not too difficult for the professor to cite some instance in which leftist propaganda had been analyzed and castigated.

But the professor chose neither of these obviously suitable methods of reply. In a letter under date of July 18 he wrote that he was pleased to have the criti-

*Author of *The Propaganda Menace*, Century, 1935.

cism sent him and that "later on we hope to print the analyses some of our readers have made of us," and asked if the Institute might have permission to print all or part of the particular criticism of this writer.

Permission was granted, of course, but so far as this writer knows, the Institute never published this particular criticism of its operations, or any others.

Such was the great "educational" experiment, carried on by disciples of John Dewey at Columbia and other great universities, and high in the councils of the National Education Association and its departments, divisions, commissions and committees.

At least some advance toward objectivity was made, even if with reluctance and in a negative way, when the Institute for Propaganda Analysis folded up.

VI

PREOCCUPATION WITH DEMOCRACY

Readers of yearbooks, handbooks, manuals, periodicals and other publications of The National Education Association cannot fail to be impressed with a feeling that the writers have a preoccupation with the slogan word "democracy" and its derivatives which amounts to obsession.

Schools, they write, must be located in centers of democracy and themselves must be democratic "from stem to gudgeon." Administration, financing, planning and operation must be democratic; every unit, every class, every lesson must be democratic. So emphatic and so oft-repeated are these demands that we well may wonder whether the teachers, if they tried to follow all this advice and all these demands, could find time to think about anything else or teach anything else.

All this might be "bearable," considered as a not-too-harmful foible, were these shouters for democracy able to get together in agreement as to what democracy is, why they are shouting for it, and what they hope to gain from their insistence upon democracy. We may wonder if, when they did decide what democracy is, they still would maintain, as so many of them do, that our American Republic is a democracy.

So important to our educators is the teaching of democracy they devote entire books to the subject. An example is *Learning the Ways of Democracy*, published in 1940 with The National Education Associa-

tion and its department, American Association of School Administrators, as joint sponsors, with the Educational Policies Commission, appointed by the sponsoring organizations, supplying the content.

Early in the authors' consideration of "The Course of Study," Chapter II of the book, they offer "promising units in American history." First of the offerings is one which was developed at Fieldston School in New York City, around the question, "What Is the American Tradition?" The course outline is presented on Pages 51 and 52 as follows:

What Is the American Tradition?

- I. Is it democratic?
 - a. In the political field
 1. Extension of franchise
 2. Reform spirit in political parties
 3. Institutions giving greater popular control
 - b. In the economic field
 1. Distribution of income
 2. Amount of social control of economic life
 - c. In the social field
 1. Amount of equality of opportunity
 - a. Among different income groups
 - b. Among races
 - c. Between sexes
 2. Social responsibility for the care of the unfortunate
 3. Protection of the rights of the individual
- II. Is it individualistic or cooperative?
 - a. Extent of individual enterprise
 - b. Amount of collective action through government
 1. Subsidies
 2. Tariffs
 3. Land grants

- 4. Collective enterprise
- c. Private experiments in collectivism
- III. Is it tolerant?
 - a. Religion
 - b. Race
 - c. Nationality
- IV. Is it progressive?
 - a. Amount of opposition to reform
 - b. Groups opposing reform

Surely it is clear from this outline that its designers and the authors who recommend it for wider use are approaching the subject from the negative position of criticism of the American way of life, seeking to find faults which can be magnified.

This is the Communist-Socialist technique: teachers seeking to give their pupils a true understanding of the American tradition and opportunity to appreciate it would approach the subject from a positive viewpoint, with studies of the basic American documents and of the writings and sayings of the men who founded our Republic, "pointing up" the American tradition which had been developing in the Colonies for about 150 years as the pioneers savored the blessings of liberty which had been denied to them in the lands from which they came.

Theodore Roosevelt High School, Des Moines, Iowa, was reported by the authors to be using another highly significant outline. It is presented on Page 55, as follows:

Democracy and Its Competitors

- I. The background of the struggle between democracy and dictatorship
- II. Democracy and autocracy compared
 - a. A warning about definitions

- b. The meaning of democracy, nazism, fascism, sovietism
- III. Government of the United States, England and France
- IV. Government of Germany, Italy, Russia
- V. Business, agriculture and labor under democracy and dictatorship
- VI. Education and religion under democracy and dictatorship
- VII. Press and radio in modern nations
- VIII. Communism, fascism and nazism in the Western Hemisphere
- IX. Preserving and improving democracy in the United States

Designers of the Des Moines course were more than necessarily clumsy; they completely fail to conceal the fact that they wish to "encourage" the students to believe that the governments of Britain, France and the United States are democracies, and so nearly alike that they may be classified as identical in form, and totalitarian forms. The republican form, which is presented as the logical, and sole, competitor of all ours, does not appear in the "picture," nor is there indication of intention to point out basic differences between the governmental forms of Britain and France—to our "educators" they are identical.

And, more and more about "democracy"; Sections II, V and VI offer opportunity to present democracy as the only alternative to autocracy, and Section IX, frankly captioned, surely will be developed as further propaganda to conceal, or at least minimize, a fact which every American student should learn: the Founders of our American Republic were keen, well-grounded students of political science and knew quite well the difference between a republic and a democracy, and on

the basis of that knowledge, deliberately chose to write a Constitution which would establish a republic.

A third outline presented, Pages 63 and 64, was developed in Cleveland, Ohio, as a "Public Opinion" course. It follows:

Civil Rights—Significance and Repression

1. Development of Anglo-Saxon liberties
 - a. Magna Charta (1215)
 - b. Petition of Rights (1628)
 - c. Bloodless Revolution (1688)
 - d. American adaptations
 - (1) Declaration of Independence
 - (2) Bill of Rights in the Constitution
2. Civil liberty
 - a. Meaning
 - b. Personal rights
 - (1) Freedom of religion
 - (2) Freedom of speech
 - (3) Freedom of press
 - (4) Freedom of assembly
 - (5) Right of petition
 - (6) Fair trial in criminal matters
 - c. Property rights
3. Repression of civil rights—earlier examples
 - a. Alien and Sedition laws
 - b. Chattel slavery in the 19th century
 - (1) The slave
 - (2) The abolitionists
 - c. Court decisions against labor
 - d. Know Nothing Party
 - e. Ku Klux Klan
4. Effect of World War on exercise of civil rights
5. Recent restrictions
 - a. Suppressions in California
 - b. Angelo Herndon
6. Repressive legislation

7. Comparative position of civil liberties
 - a. In democracies
 - b. Under communism
 - c. Under socialism
 - d. Under fascism
8. Relation of civil liberty to public opinion

Presentation of the entire outline of the topics of the Cleveland course, just above, serves a useful purpose by showing a number of "slick tricks" for making it easy to work in propaganda of the Communist line. Subsections a, c, d and e of Section 3 and all of Sections 4, 5 and 6 offer "splendid" opportunities for besmirching our beloved America, magnifying relatively minor shortcomings in a manner to make it appear that our Bill of Rights really does not protect us. With but a minimum of imagination, a teacher can use Section 8 for the same ignoble purposes.

But it is Sections 1 and 7 which give clues to the perversions of history teaching and instruction in political science and economics which have been so common in American schools—pardon, schools in America—to the great delight of the Communist-Socialist propagandists.

American youth are being taught, openly and brazenly, that the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights are adaptations of British concepts. No statement could be further from the truth; were there even a grain of truth in the statement, the War of the Revolution need not have been fought.

The British concept always was and still is that the state is an entity which has rights, liberties and other favors to bestow upon the citizens, subjects of the state.

It was with this basic concept in mind that some small gains in the direction of human liberty were wrested

from the Crown in 1215 and 1628. The process continued, and bit by bit, power and authority has been wrested from the monarchs until now the ruling king is but the creature of Parliament, and the royal monarch must go before the national assembly and announce the program of His Majesty's Socialist Government!

The British people are no more free under a Socialist (or any other British) Parliament than they would be under a royal king; certainly Britons were not so free under the Labor Party regime as they were during the reign of Queen Victoria. This is for the reason that, as liberties were forced from the crown, they were entrusted to Parliament, not given to the people.

Thus the British Parliament is master of British citizens—they have neither written constitution nor courts to protect them from any ignominy that a power-mad Socialist Parliament may decree for them.

Our American government is based upon an entirely new and different concept which was written into our basic documents by men who rejected the British and European concept of statism. The Founders took the position that all sovereignty is of the people and belongs to the people, and they so declared in the Declaration of Independence.

Under leadership of the Founders, the citizens of the Colonies declared, fought for, and won their independence from the British crown, then proceeded to set up a government of limited power and authority. These acts constitute complete repudiation of the British concepts, and in no particular are they adaptations of these concepts.

The Founders distrusted strong government; they well knew that even a government set up by the people might well "get out of hand" and prove to be as op-

pressive a state as if it had been frankly authoritarian from its founding.

The Founders' fear of strong government sprang from their knowledge of the real nature of government. George Washington expressed this knowledge tersely when he said: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

So, in their fear of a strong government, the Founders set up the Confederation, which proved to be too weak; it was agreed that a stronger central or federal government was needed, but the Founders were extremely cautious; the Constitution gives the Federal government only limited powers, and the Tenth Amendment provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

The United States government, as set up by the Thirteen Free Commonwealths which had been British Colonies, was of a new and theretofore unknown pattern; it never has been copied.

True enough, from time to time, republics have been set up in various places on the globe, notably in South America. But no people has had the will and the courage to go all the way and set up a government with a written Constitution and Bill of Rights which protect the liberties of the people as they are guarded and made safe in our America. And no other people in the world have abandoned completely the Old World idea of the state as an entity which of itself has power and sovereignty, and the authority to act as custodian of human liberties and pass them out to the subjects of the state at the will of the rulers.

Of course the superiority of the American form of

government does not lie primarily in its uniqueness, nor in the fact that it is a representative or republican form.

Rather, our American liberties are safe and protected because ours is a government of law rather than a government of men, and the basic law is the moral law given to men in the Ten Commandments as confirmed and added to by New Testament teachings.

These basic American principles, so different from the ideologies of Europe, Asia and Africa, have been taught all too sparingly in the schools of our nation during recent decades, and, if the "bosses" of National Education Association are allowed to have their way, no American child ever will hear of them again.

Insistence of the leaders of NEA that schools must teach that America is a democracy was shown in the three recommended outlines presented earlier in this chapter, and could be shown in literally hundreds of other quotations from NEA publications.

From the Fourteenth *Yearbook* of the Department of Superintendence, titled *The Social Studies Curriculum*, comes this choice bit:

The Democracy Theme. Democracy as a way of living, thinking and governing has rapidly become one of the most challenging of contemporary problems. Effective living in the present and in the future must of necessity be based upon a significant understanding of the principles of democracy. The term "democracy" is used in the sense of a social ideal that intends a full realization of individual potentialities, personal participation in determining decision, or, in brief, an abundant life for ALL.

Of course the idea of "one for all, all for one," must

not be carried too far in one particular field, that of the teaching profession. It appears all too clearly that the top-drawer intelligentsia of the profession considers itself as a class set apart, a caste of untouchables of a special priesthood.

At the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in November, 1949, the Council declared by resolution, as reported in *Social Education* for May, 1951, Page 234:

The Council opposes the official blacklisting of materials for student use. The choice of appropriate materials for educational purposes in the social studies must, in our opinion, be made in accordance with educational standards and needs. The blacklisting of textbooks is a threat to the freedom of expression traditionally allowed authors and publishers for the purpose of producing materials representative of every viewpoint. Such blacklisting tends to encourage the textbook industry to abandon its allegiance to principles of freedom and to conform to the views and official pronouncements of pressure groups.

Nothing in the philosophy of "democracy" contemplates setting up a specially privileged class, a minority which may not be criticized by the majority or any person or group not a member of the "untouchables." Nor can it be considered as an American concept that parents shall surrender complete control over the training of their children to an agency of the state; American courts have sternly rebuked all such suggestions.*

*In *Pierce v. Society of the Sisters*, 268 U. S. 510, 1925, the U. S. Supreme Court affirmed decrees of lower courts restraining and enjoining enforcement of a Compulsory Education Act adopted by initiative procedure in the State of Oregon in 1922. The challenged

Returning to the Seventeenth *Yearbook* of The National Council for the Social Studies, *The Study and Teaching of American History*, we find more laudation of democracy, with historical references presumed to bolster the thesis that democracy holds all the keys to human happiness and liberty. From Page 64:

Almost unanimously, historians and educators tell us that the world view that defines "desirable" for Americans in 1946 is the democratic way of life. The democratic way expresses our ultimate assumptions as to the good life.

Since the Greeks worked out their rudimentary democracy, the world has been a stage for a great struggle between various forms of authority and an emergent democracy. One act of this struggle has been set in America, a land whose historic commitment has been to democracy, an ideal embodied in its documents from the Mayflower Compact through the Atlantic Charter.

We have reason to suspect that the great majority of those writers who are accepted by policy makers of NEA as historians *are* willing that "the world view" shall prevail, and our belief that considerably less than a majority of present-day educators want other nations to dictate America's policies may be only wishful thinking. But we know that millions of run-of-the-mill Americans now reject "the democratic way of

act required parents to send children of school age to public schools rather than to private or parochial schools. In the affirming opinion Justice McReynolds wrote: "Under the doctrine of *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U. S. 390, we think it entirely plain that the act of 1922 unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control. . . . The child is not the mere creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

life" and millions more will reject it when the issues are clarified and they understand what promoters of "democracy" really have in mind.

Let these promoters deny it all they will; let the apologists protest and protest again that the word meanings have changed, but the fact remains that democracy is government by men, not a government of law, and to its chief promoters, democracy is synonymous with socialism.

In a democracy, the majority rules, which easily resolves into rule of the strong, the old jungle rule. Rather than government by law, in democracy the principle is *vox populi, vox dei*; the voice of the people is the voice of God; to all religionists, Christians and Jews in particular, this is heresy.

We pause only momentarily to note the reference to the "rudimentary democracy" of the Greeks. As a matter of fact the Greeks had a highly developed form of democracy; the only reason the Greek form does not serve well as pattern for modern seekers after democracy is the fact that the Greek system was superimposed upon a slave system which made the easy life in the "upper strata" economically feasible.

The declaration that America is a "land whose historic commitment has been to democracy, an ideal embodied in all its documents from the Mayflower Pact through the Atlantic Charter," requires more extended consideration.

The Atlantic Charter is not, by definition, an American document. It is an inter-nation agreement binding together several of the so-called Western democracies, the United States in the Western Hemisphere, all the others in the Eastern Hemisphere. Earlier in this chapter it was pointed out that basic ideologies of America and the European nations are completely dif-

ferent. Recently we had an authentic word that the situations are different in Europe and America, today as always.

Wisconsin's governor, Walter J. Kohler, returned from a summer tour of Europe, wrote of his observations in *The Milwaukee Journal* for October 7, 1951:

"Nowhere in Europe does there exist the free, productive, competitive system of providing goods and services which in the United States goes by the name of 'free enterprise' or capitalism," Governor Kohler wrote, and continuing:

In France or Italy, if you want to start a business, it is necessary to make application for a license. This application is referred to the "syndicate" or trade association of those already established in the business—in short, your potential competitors—for a "recommendation." Under these circumstances it is understandable that a favorable "recommendation" might be hard to get.

In the United States our philosophy of capitalism is to reduce costs, lower prices to widen markets, raise wages as productivity increases, and constantly to improve products and production methods in the certain conviction that if we don't do so, our competitors will.

Such a philosophy is wholly alien to most European countries. From the earliest beginnings of the guilds there has been inculcated in the European mind the philosophy of restricting competition, allocating markets, controlling prices at high levels and keeping wages at low levels—the exact opposite of our American beliefs.

Admitting that a short visit in England is insufficient for a complete analysis of the British situation, the

governor insisted that he believes he found some clues which suggest possible answers to questions Americans are asking. He wrote in part:

Anyone may keep a pig, but if he slaughters it for his own use, he must give up his bacon ration for a year. Why keep a pig?

The maximum retainable income under British tax laws is about \$15,000 a year. Why try to earn more?

Coal production in England is currently running below the 1938 levels. It appears to be the key to her economy. I was told that 80% of England's automobile production is sold in export and that if an Englishman wants to buy a car he must wait five or six years for it.

"Why not increase production to take care of the domestic market?" I asked.

"We don't have enough steel," I was told.

"Why not make more steel?"

"Because we don't have enough iron ore from Sweden."

"Why not more ore?"

"Because we don't have enough coal to trade with Sweden for her ore?"

"Why not more coal?"

"Because the mines are getting deeper and harder to work. The miners are working for the government and don't think they should work so hard. Besides, taxes are so high they are not interested in getting more pay."

Another sad story of a vicious circle is revealed here: would that it might show some of our eager propagandists for "democracy" that even short ventures into collectivism bring loss of liberty.

Having reviewed the claims of the *Yearbook* edi-

tors relative to the democracy of the Greeks and of Atlantic Pact nations other than the United States, it remains to examine the presumption that democracy is "an ideal embodied in . . . the Mayflower Compact."

All right: will all those members of the class who can recite at least three lines of the Mayflower Compact please raise their hands?

What, no hands? Too bad. Well, fortunately, the Compact is not a lengthy document, so the class—and "teacher"—will review it here:

In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign Lord, King James, by the grace of God of Great Britain, France & Ireland King, defender of the faith, etc., having undertaken for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents, solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.

According to Henry Steele Commager of New York University in his *Documents of American History*, "The Compact was not intended as a constitution, but was an extension of the customary church covenant to civil circumstances," but as the Plymouth settlers never

were able to secure a charter, the Compact remained the only form of constitution of the colony.

From reading the Compact we learn that the forty-one signers declared themselves to be loyal subjects of King James and citizens of his realm, and that their objectives were "advancement of the Christian faith and of our King and country"; neither of these objectives are in the "democratic tradition" or constitute a "commitment to democracy."

Very possibly it would be wrong to declare that the Plymouth Colonists had no aspirations for liberty of assemblage, press, petition and other rights and liberties, but if we can believe their own words, their prime objective was freedom of religion along lines which they believed would be "for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith."

And what could be more natural, in view of the fact that the Christian faith which they held is the most individualistic of all religions, and so clearly recognizes the basic human right to own property, that in an environment created to protect religious liberty, these religionists should find, and come to value the fact, that all the other liberties mentioned in the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights go hand in hand with religious liberty?

Certainly it is to be hoped that American citizens generally have a greater appreciation of these relationships than do those teachers who, presumably, accept as gospel all the propaganda for democracy which emanates from the headquarters of National Education Association.

In other chapters of this book much evidence is presented to show that the official NEA position is that "advance" in the social-economic field is toward democracy and collectivism, the two words being used

substantially as synonyms. This position is identical with that of both Socialists and Communists.

It would be hard to name a more authoritative spokesman for Socialism than Thomas Mann. True, he is not an American, but he and his writings have been widely accepted in America, and he has the further qualification of being able to present that "world view" which our NEA editors value so highly.

In the year 1938 the great scholar, acclaimed by the *New York Times* as "Germany's greatest writer," toured the United States. He was received with acclaim from coast to coast by the supposedly most intelligent people in the United States, and the halls and banquet rooms where this honored visitor delivered his lecture, "The Coming Victory of Democracy," were packed to the doors.

So important did the intelligentsia consider this lecture that it was published in book form by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., under the same title as the lecture. Here is one of the choicer bits from the book:

That is why I call socialism a moral impulse, because its interests are essentially in internal and not in external politics; its passion is justice, right not might. . . .

Europe and the world are ripe for an inclusive reform of the regulation of natural resources and the redistribution of wealth.

If democracy wishes to make its undoubted moral superiority over fascism effective, and challenge its pseudo socialism, it must adopt in the economic as well as the spiritual domain as much of the socialistic morality as the times make imperative and indispensable.

The Socialist has no monopoly on ability to describe

his ideology in the terminology of democracy. Communists do it also. Earl Browder served the Communist Party for many years as its national secretary, and during this period he was the recognized spokesman for the Party. On March 21, 1943, he engaged in debate with George E. Sokolsky, syndicated columnist, at Manhattan Center, New York. The debate was arranged by *New Masses*, Communist publication, which published the addresses of the two speakers in a pamphlet titled *Is Communism a Menace?* In this pamphlet Comrade Browder is quoted as saying:

Theoretically there are two ways of buttressing democracy with economic foundations; one way is to break up modern large-scale industry . . .; the second way is to vest the ownership and operation of large-scale industry in the hands of the community, organized in the state. . . . There are no other ways of perpetuating possible democracy. . . . This is the democratic argument for socialism or communism. If the further development of democracy is our chief goal, then the necessity for some form of socialism is clearly established.

To make it completely "official," beyond question and beyond possibility of quibbling, we turn to an official document of the Communist Party to show that in Communist-Socialist lingo democracy and socialism are synonymous. The quotation is from the Constitution of the Communist Party of the USA as adopted by the Tenth National Convention, May 27-31, 1938, and amended by the Special Convention, November 16-17, 1940:

The Communist Party of the United States of

America is a working class political party carrying forward the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, and the Declaration of Independence; it upholds the achievements of democracy, the right of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and defends the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties; it is devoted to defense of the immediate interests of workers, farmers, and all toilers against capitalist exploitation, and to preparation of the working class for its historic mission to unite and lead the American people to extend these democratic principles to their necessary and logical conclusions:

By establishing common ownership of the national economy, through a government of the people; the abolition of all exploitation of man by man, nation by nation, and race by race, and thereby the abolition of class divisions in society; that is by the establishment of socialism, according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International; and the free cooperation of the American people with those of other lands, striving toward a world without oppression and war, a world brotherhood of man.

To this end, the Communist Party of the United States of America establishes the basic laws of its organization in this Constitution.

The three paragraphs quoted above constitute the Preamble of the Party Constitution as published by the official publishing house of the Party, Workers Library Publishers.

This Communist Party approach makes it clear that one of the best reasons why the teaching profession

should abstain from its ceaseless prattle about democracy is that the Communist-Socialist movement has "adopted" the word and is using it for the Party's own purposes. As a result, it is difficult, and at times virtually impossible, for readers and listeners to know who is writing and talking about principles which could be considered as American, and who is using the double talk of the followers of Karl Marx.

Even were this not true, the fact would remain that the proponents of "democracy" are wholly unable to agree upon the meaning of the word. To say, as so many do, that it is "a way of life," means less than nothing; no other currently used definitions have any close relation to reality.

As to why the educators should stop insisting that the American form of government is a democracy, the reasons are many. Those who so insist are not just being unrealistic—they are perverting history.

We are not, as some may believe, in a "trap" merely because the Communist-Socialist propagandists are so adept at using the current terminology to describe their own evil purposes. It is our own fault insofar and so long as we insist upon using terminology of the Communists' own choosing and liking.

Teachers could refer to America as what it is, a special kind of republic, a government by law, that law being the moral law of the Judeo-Christian faith, the Ten Commandments; Communist-Socialist propagandists would have nothing to do with this kind of language—they could find no use for it—it could not be adapted to their purposes.

The usual "alibi" offered by leaders of the teaching profession for their refusal to face up to the facts is that they are but following the popular trends and the "leads" of other professions, including the lexicograph-

ers who have perverted our language by writing dictionary definitions with such weasel words as "representative democracy," and in other ways making it appear that there is not, after all, any difference between a republic and a democracy.

But how often we have observed declaration by and on behalf of the teaching profession that the teachers must lead, not follow! Why do they hesitate to take the lead in the direction of truth and realism?

In this particular case or any other, is it a proper function of the teaching profession to perpetuate error?

And finally, if the teachers persist in insisting that our American Republic really is a democracy, what word or phrase will they use to designate a form of government which *is* a democracy?

VII

FOSTERING MATERIALISTIC
EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

Since the philosophy of Communism-Socialism is basically materialistic, rejecting all spiritual values and all supernaturalism, the most important step which a prospective convert must take before he can accept the Marxian doctrines is rejection of all religion, most particularly the most individualistic of all religions, which is Christianity.

Insofar, then, as educators ignore and reject all spiritual concepts, they are playing directly into the hands of followers of Karl Marx, and quite naturally the Marxians will approve and applaud. Quite as naturally they will do all they can to speed any trend in the direction of materializing and paganizing education which may develop or appear to be developing.

Admittedly it is not possible to teach religion in the tax-supported schools of this nation. This is not, as is so generally assumed, because of prohibition in the First Amendment to the Constitution—no such prohibition exists. The amendment prohibits Congress from making any “law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” The first clause of the quotation from the Amendment outlaws state churches; the second clause prohibits interference with individuals in their religious beliefs and practices.

The situation as regards prohibition of established churches is well stated in *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*, published in 1951 by the Educa-

tional Policies Commission of National Education Association, in which we read, Pages 5 and 6:

America was founded by a God-fearing people. The Constitution and Bill of Rights clearly recognize the existence of religious ideals, while guaranteeing to each person freedom to worship God according to the mandates of his own personal convictions. Rejection of a state religion or of state religions is not the same thing as rejection of religion itself.

Furthermore, it must be understood that the First Amendment, like all the others, pertains only to the Federal Government and restrains only Congress. Should any state wish to allow teaching of religion in the schools, not even the most "tortured" construction of the First Amendment by the U. S. Supreme Court could be raised as a bar to such teaching.

However the several states have incorporated similar provisions in their own Constitutions, and usually the courts have construed them to bar teaching of religion in the schools.

In some localities and in some states, reading the Bible in the public schools is allowed or required. In a Nebraska case, *State v. Scheve*, 65 Nebraska, 853, 91 N. W. 846, it was held:

The fact that the King James translation may be used to inculcate sectarian doctrines affords no presumption that it will be so used. The law does not forbid the use of the Bible in either version in the public schools, it is not proscribed either by the Constitution or the statutes, and the courts have no right to declare its use to be unlawful. The point where the courts may rightfully inter-

vene . . . is where a teacher employed to give secular instruction has violated the Constitution by becoming a sectarian propagandist.

Such court decisions as the above give encouragement to those who believe that the time may come when public schools will offer broad religious education covering only those religious teachings upon which all denominational groups in the community will agree. But it is clear that before this can be done on a state-wide scale, the Constitution of the state must be amended.

As the situation now stands, school administrators should take notice of two "negatives" as regards court rulings: (1) while the courts have not ruled on the point, it would seem reasonable for educators to assume that any existing prohibitions of the teaching of religion also should preclude the teaching of atheism or anti-religion, and (2) the courts never have ruled nor indicated that they might rule in support of a ban to teaching *about* religion; this means that no bar exists to explanation in the schools of the place religion has held in the lives of the people and its influence in shaping the histories of nations.

The Educational Policies Commission, in the book just referred to, seems to support the contention that the schools may teach *about* religion, but with many reservations and limitations. Pages 77-79:

The public school can teach objectively *about* religion without advocating or teaching any religious creed. To omit from the classroom all references to religion and the institution of religion is to neglect an important part of American life. Knowledge about religion is essential for a full understanding of our culture, literature, art, history, and current affairs. . . .

The current facts about the churches and their influence in the United States should also be taught at appropriate points in the social studies curriculum. What, for example, are the principle religious bodies; what are the numbers of their adherents; what legal standing does religion have with respect to taxation, the courts, the Armed Forces? These are matters of obvious civic and social importance; by that token the public schools should teach about them.

But earlier in the book, it is made clear that the teacher may not recognize religion as a controlling force in the making of decisions! Chapter III, titled "Sanctions," instructs the teacher on the reasons which may be advanced for the making of correct moral decisions. The "sanctions" named and approved, pages 39-45, are the sense of justice; respect for or fear of the law; respect for property rights; integrity; group approval; yielding to authority, and guidance along the lines of appeal to one or more of the foregoing.

To remove all doubt as to why no "sanction" relating to religion is included—the teacher may not tell the pupils that a good reason for abstaining from petty larceny is the fact that such action would be in violation of one of the Ten Commandments—the "manual" instructs, Page 46, that:

The powerful sanctions of religious creeds and doctrines have not been included in the above illustration. They may not be explicitly invoked in the public school classroom, but of course they may play a powerful role in the moral and spiritual instruction of home and church.

What the members of the Educational Policies Com-

mission really have in mind when they talk about "moral and spiritual values" is made clearer in a recorded address by Dr. William G. Carr, associate secretary of National Education Association. This address is one of a group prepared for presentation during American Education Week; the title is the same as that of the book from which we have been quoting.

Ten "values of American life which all good schools can teach" are named by Dr. Carr in his address. They are, respect for the individual; moral responsibility; recognition that our institutions are our servants; common consent; respect for truth; respect for excellence; moral equality; brotherhood; opportunity to pursue happiness, and spiritual enrichment. Summing up, Dr. Carr says:

Such values arise from many sources;—from the creative expressions of human spirit, from masterpieces of art and architecture, from great religious pageantry, from the memory of heroic men and women who have nobly served humanity, from contemplation of the stars or of a blade of grass, from simple ceremonies of thankfulness or of grief, from the smile of a well-loved companion, from poetry and music.

Readers who believe that religion holds the ultimate in values and provides the most valid sanctions will find small comfort in Dr. Carr's words. Religion is mentioned only in connection with suggested observation of "great religious pageantry," something which is obnoxious to large sections of the Protestant world.

And from the attitude of many officially appointed spokesmen for National Education Association toward things religious, one might suspect that they do indeed appreciate the power of sanctions based in religion,

and realize that the shaping of men's thinking under compulsion of these sanctions is not in the general direction of collectivism.

Indications of definite desire to materialize and paganize the education of youth are to be found in many of the writings of the NEA spokesmen. Turning to Page 30 of *Education for Family Life*, Nineteenth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, 1941, we read:

We must . . . remember that socialized conduct, for example what we call private property and the sanctity of the person, is not natural biological behavior. It is, rather, learned patterns of conduct, of respecting the inviolability of things and persons, approachable only thru the group-sanctioned institutional patterns of contract, barter, buying and selling, courtship and marriage, employment, and the like.

Christian parents will repudiate this philosophy when they become aware that it is being taught to their children. Christians understand that the basis of our laws, yes, the basis of our American culture, lies in the Ten Commandments. Calling our culture a set of "group-sanctioned, institutional patterns" does not alter that fact.

Origin of the "group sanctioned" concepts of inviolability of persons does not lie in "patterns" designed by men, but in Commandments Five to Ten, inclusive. Briefly stated, they are: (Five) "Honor thy father and thy mother"; (Six) "Thou shalt not kill"; (Seven) "Thou shalt not commit adultery"; (Eight) "Thou shalt not steal"; (Nine) "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," and (10) "Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbor's."

Commandments Five, Six and Nine clearly bear upon the importance and dignity of the individual; Commandment Seven lays the basis for the institutions of marriage and the family, and Commandments Eight and Ten give divine sanction to the concept that no human rights are more important than the right of property ownership. In the Communist-Socialist Utopia, where all property is held in common, nobody could steal anything; and since every citizen would have everything he needs, how could anyone covet anything which his neighbor happened to have in his possession, though not owning it?

The family was instituted as a social unit by divine command. This view has been rejected by all collectivists since Plato wrote *The Republic*; the family is anathema to them; they rail at it, seek to belittle it, propose many sorts of communal arrangements as a substitute for it on the plea that they would be more "economic." Actually, of course, the collectivist animus stems from the fact that the family is the foe of all forms of collectivism.

Sentiments similar — almost exactly parallel — to those expressed by authors of the *Yearbook* last quoted, are to be found in the chapter "Anthropology and World History," of *Improving the Teaching of World History*, Twentieth Yearbook of The National Council for the Social Studies, 1949. The chapter on anthropology was written by M. F. Ashley Montagu, chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Rutgers University, and the *Yearbook* was edited by Edith West, a director of the Council and head of the Department of Social Studies, University of Minnesota High School, Minneapolis, Minn. Quoting:

It should be remembered that so far as human

behavior is concerned, the one thing natural to man is to be artificial—artificial in the sense that man's behavior is made up of learned, acquired abstractions and motor activities calculated to make him more comfortable in the world in which he finds himself. Human nature, in short, is what man makes of man or perhaps more accurately, what he makes of the children.

Religionists will not reject completely the concept that men have influence in shaping the lives, even the characters, of other men; Christians do believe in Christian education and Christian training in the home. But Christians, and all other religionists, must reject the claim that Christian or other religious behavior, or any human behavior, is completely artificial.

Preliminary to further discussion of this point, we move into the highest echelons of the teaching profession for the final example of National Education Association exploits in materializing and paganizing the education of American youth.

Harry Elmer Barnes wrote the chapter, "Modern Social Development," of the book last quoted, *Improving the Teaching of World History*. It is not strange that Dr. Barnes was chosen to write this chapter, for he is the favorite historian of the ultra-moderns of the educational field; presumably this is because he discards as outworn all the old patterns by which our forefathers, and his, struggled, sometimes died, in their quest for liberty. He is a true "liberal," a ranking prince of the intelligentsia.

Nearly half a column of *Who's Who in America* is required to list the names of the books Dr. Barnes has written and the colleges at which he has taught and lectured. It appears that he has specialized in teaching and lecturing at summer school sessions of the uni-

versities. These summer sessions are freely patronized by teachers seeking advanced degrees and unable to go to the "fountain head" of materialist teaching, Columbia University's Teachers College.

But all is not lost for the poorly financed teachers who cannot travel to Columbia University for summer study; at these summer sessions Dr. Barnes brings them the authentic, simon pure Teachers' College viewpoint, *a la* John Dewey and William H. Kilpatrick. In the above-mentioned chapter of the *Yearbook* Dr. Barnes wrote:

The rise of the middle class in number, power and prestige was the outstanding social transformation of early modern history. The middle class not only increased in size, but also became more diversified. The new aspects of commerce and industry led to a more highly developed specialization of labor among the business and professional classes.

The materialistic theology of Protestantism provided a religious sanction for the practices and increasing prestige of the bourgeoisie.

The Industrial Revolution and the complex civilization which it has produced have rendered necessary a vast increase in state intervention and have extended control over an ever-larger number of social activities.

Some will not agree with Dr. Barnes' choice of the "outstanding social transformation," but the point will not be discussed here; and the habit of the intelligentsia to accept the Marxian class struggle theories has been sufficiently dealt with elsewhere in this book.

Nor will the present writer quarrel with Dr. Barnes on the subject matter of the second quoted paragraph

insofar as it offers the assumption that free enterprise and Protestantism have proven compatible. But this compatibility is not the result of any materialism in Protestantism, and this writer is affronted, and sorely, to be told by such a crass materialist as Dr. Barnes that Protestantism is a materialistic philosophy or theology.

The truth, of course, is that Christianity is the most spiritual and least materialistic of all religions, and that Protestantism, based so largely in the doctrine of justification by faith, is the most spiritual and least materialistic "phase" or branch of Christianity.

In this humble writer's opinion, it is nothing short of scandalous that such a materialist as Dr. Barnes should be advanced as an instructor of teachers, and in that capacity he should be allowed to use the prestige of National Education Association to besmirch Protestantism, and, inferentially all Christian faiths, because, if Protestantism is materialistic, all other Christian sects must be at least tinged with materialism.

To make clear Dr. Barnes' position as a materialist, the fact is cited that *Twilight of Christianity*, Vanguard Press, 1929, is one of Dr. Barnes' better-known books, and in the Preface (Page v) he states his position plainly as "cordial to any type of secular religion devoted to the cause of making life here on earth more pleasant and worth-while" and as opposed to "all vestiges of the old supernaturalism."

On Page 85 of this book Dr. Barnes takes his position "flatly" as favoring legalized abortion; on the following page he blames Christianity for the prevalence of venereal disease! He argues that if religionists would quit trying to frighten people and "prepare them to indulge decently and safely," then "progress of preventive medicine" would solve the problem.

But the opus of which Dr. Barnes is particularly

proud is the massive two-volume work, *The History of Western Civilization*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., 1935. On Page 1103 of Volume II, in the chapter titled "Cultural Lag and the Human Outlook," is found this "illuminating" passage:

We have been especially reluctant to bring the control of sex and the family into harmony with contemporary scientific and esthetic considerations. Our sex mores and family institutions embody: (1) A primitive reaction to the mystery of sex and of women in particular; (2) Hebraic uxoriousness and conceptions of patriarchal male domination; (3) patristic and medieval views regarding the baseness of sex and sex temptation, especially as offered by women; (4) the medieval esteem for virginity in women; (5) the sacramental view of marriage, which leads us to regard marriage as a theological rather than a social issue; (6) the property views of the early bourgeoisie; and (7) the Kantian rationalization of personal inadequacy and inexperience. There is hardly a single item in the sex mores of a conventionally respectable American today that squares with either science or esthetics.

It is not the intention here to present Dr. Barnes as a "low person." Presumably he is a man of high moral standards, and in view of his position, it is almost certain that he conducts his own personal life in a manner parallel to that of the "conventionally responsible American" at whom he scoffs. Also it is highly probable that if some rake were to talk to his wife or daughter in the manner he writes for teachers and college students, Dr. Barnes would react rather violently. But if his innermost thinking as expressed in his writings are not to the liking of those responsible

for the policies of National Education Association, why do they put him forward as an instructor of teachers?

Now to consideration of the third paragraph of the quotation from the Barnes chapter in the *Yearbook*. In this paragraph Dr. Barnes tells all his readers—some of them gullible enough to believe—that the Industrial Revolution and its result (a complex situation) have made it *necessary* for the state to intervene in social relationships and extend control over a wide variety of social activities.

This declaration merely restates, in easier-to-understand words, the Marxian theory of the materialist conception of history, also called economic determinism. Frederick Engels, Marx's collaborator in writing the *Communist Manifesto*, stated their joint theory this way in *Anti-Duhring*:

The ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in the heads of men, not in their better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in the changes in the methods of production and exchange; they are to be sought not in the *philosophy*, but in the *economics* of the particular epoch.

According to this Marx-Engel-Barnes reasoning, man created a juggernaut which is sweeping civilization relentlessly into a collectivist society, already foreshadowed by increasing state intervention and extended control over an ever-growing number of social activities.

All of this is a particularly nauseous brand of hogwash. In our complex civilization a great many things happen, and when a goodly number of similar events take place at the same time or in similar places, we are

likely to term the combined happenings a "social trend."

All these "social trends" are the results of the acts of men; machines have no part in developing or shaping "social trends," nor are there in the world any mechanistic, relentless "social forces" with power to thrust men back into the dark ages of subservience to the state. If men do ultimately surrender themselves and their destinies to the tender mercies of the all-powerful state, it will be because they lack the courage and the stamina to check and reverse the "social trends" which are their own creation.

Man was created to be free, which means that he was given the ability to discriminate between the beautiful and the ugly, the difficult and the easy, and between good and evil. Not only may the free man discriminate—he may choose, make his choice as to which he will accept and cherish, which he will reject and discard.

Exercising this God-given right of choice, men discarded the old, back-breaking methods of production by muscle power and hand dexterity; they developed machines which took over the worst of the drudgery.

Thus was created the "industrial revolution," with division of labor and production of goods and services of quality and in quantity which had not been dreamed of prior to the realization.

The machines do no thinking, no choosing between possible alternatives; neither do the goods produced by use of the machines. Only men make decisions; only men act on the decisions they make. What happens in our social-economic life is no more and no less than the "grand summation" of all the actions of men based upon the decisions which they, as individuals, have made.

Men are not perfect; all too often they make wrong decisions. Many of the decisions made in the past were not wise; men are prone to choose the easy way in preference to the hard way, the ugly rather than the beautiful, the evil rather than the good.

But nothing is written in the stars, any more than it is made certain by "economic determinism," that always a majority of men must go on choosing those courses of action which are in the direction of surrendering human liberty.

It is possible, if not too probable, that from some source or other—perhaps from the teachings of the Man of Galilee—men who previously have acted upon decisions to take the easy way, may gain the inspiration, the will and the courage to make decisions which will be in the direction of recapturing and retaining human liberties by and for themselves.

Should any great number of men make such decisions and act upon them, the present "social trends" would go into reverse and move again in the direction in which they were moving when the Founders wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Insofar as teachers listen to and follow leaders who have accepted the Marxian theory of a mechanistic social system and thereby deny the possibility that men can be free if they will to be free, the schools in their charge are unworthy of the confidence of parents who naturally assume that schools in America are functioning as American schools.

VIII

PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL
COLLECTIVISM

Eagerness to indoctrinate the youth of the land with the ideology of all-powerful world government is evident in writings of leaders and spokesmen for National Education Association bearing on many subjects, and teachers are urged to offer this propaganda in connection with consideration of all types of instruction. For example, in *Citizens for a New World*, Fourteenth Yearbook of The National Council for the Social Studies, 1943, teachers are instructed, Pages 167-8, that

International Relations is a subject to be taught all through the curriculum, in all fields of subject matter, and at all levels—elementary, secondary and college. Though the principal emphasis can and should be placed in the social studies field, incidental reference may be made in other fields of study.

Suggestions for “such correlations of the topic” give hints as to how the subject can be introduced into English classes, speech classes, science classes and art classes.

The internationalists who are in control of National Education Association policies disdain to conceal their aims. It is no loose federation of states which they advocate; no wishy-washy League of Nations would be

acceptable, nor do they care for the present United Nations with its actions hampered by veto powers. The demand for super-government for the world, with the "logic" often used for presentation, is stated briefly but convincingly on Pages 22-23 of *Citizens for a New World*:

No state can be expected to disarm and give up its right to make war so long as war is the only means provided by which that state can protect itself or secure justice for itself. Until a substitute for war is provided which can give reasonable assurance to a state that its interest will be protected and that justice will be done for it, war can never be brought under control. Consequently, the community of nations must provide not only an international police force, such as people now demand; it must also provide means by which disputes can be fairly settled and by which an unjust situation can be changed. This means a complete international government with judicial and legislative agencies as well as the physical power to enforce decisions. It would not be just to demand that a state should give up the right to use force if this use of force is the only means by which it can protect itself.

The *Yearbook* from which the foregoing quotation was made was "planned and published with the co-operation and support" of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, of which James T. Shotwell was chairman, Clark M. Eichelberger, director, and William Allen Neilson, chairman of the executive committee. The book was edited by Erling M. Hunt, of Columbia University, and editor of *Social Education*.

Claims that the world-government-minded teachers,

curriculum directors and textbook writers are making steady progress in their efforts at indoctrination are found on Page 51–52 of the seventeenth *Yearbook* of the Council (for Social Studies) which was published under the title, *The Study and Teaching of American History*:

A new emphasis on international affairs and America's place in the world has come into American history courses since the First World War. While all three levels of American history instruction have been affected, the emphasis appears to be stronger at the Senior-high-school level than at either of the preceding cycles. In one widely used senior-high-school text, over one-third of the pages classified as political history dealt with American foreign relations. Each of the fourteen senior-high-school courses analyzed in the Bruner survey included a treatment of "The United States as a World Power," and all but one of the courses gave some attention to "international and peace relations."

So eager are these pedagogical proponents of world super-government to press their propaganda that they resort to statements which are inadequately described when called absurdities, and advocate "sidetracking" Constitutional provisions as the most likely method of bringing about surrender of America's sovereignty.

For an example of gross absurdity, we turn again to the Fourteenth *Yearbook* of the Social Studies Council, where we read, pages 57–58:

In international affairs the hitherto sovereign states have claimed to be the judges in their own cause. This is denial of the rule of law; sovereignty means the refusal to be bound by law, and

is, therefore, a doctrine of anarchy. If nations remain sovereign, international law exists on the frailest of foundations and in only relatively minor matters. If we are to bring orderly relations and the necessary routing out of the great mass of interdependence outlined above, we must have internationally enforceable law.

In America, as is shown in greater detail elsewhere in this little book, sovereignty rests with the people, belongs to them. For the purpose of bringing about orderly government, limited sovereignty has been yielded by the people to the state and federal government. And this is anarchy, according to our textbook writers and curriculum directors! No world super-government, custodian of all sovereignty, exists except in the minds of its proponents, but in their hesitance to yield sovereignty to a non-existent world government, Americans are guilty of rejecting all sovereignty, if we were to accept as valid the "vaporings" of this over-eager proponent of world dictatorship.

Equally extravagant statements are made in connection with presentation of the claim that the treaty-making provisions of our Constitution were a mistake at the outset, and that only by nullifying these provisions can America hope to be saved—salvation consisting of surrendering all sovereignty to world government. The *Yearbook* authors tell us, Pages 104–105 :

The constitutional requirement that one-third of the Senate may block any treaty was a mistake on the day it was made. The treaty clause never worked once as it was intended—with the President and twenty-six Senators sitting as an intimate executive council. Constitutions have been made by the dozen, all over the world, since 1789, but

no other country has ever copied our treaty veto. We remain the only country in which one sixteenth of the national legislature can block the conduct of the nation's foreign relations. . . .

Yet it is intolerable that the anachronism of the treaty veto shall leave us helpless to take our full part in organizing against a Third World War. The strangle-hold of a constantly recruited "battalion of death" upon our foreign affairs must be ended.

Fortunately, several different ways are open to us: (1) a constitutional amendment; (2) an advance pledge by two-thirds of the Senate to support strong effective organization of the peace; (3) the approval of our international agreements by joint resolution of Congress; and (4) the conduct of our foreign affairs through executive agreements alone, supported by such enabling legislation as the Congress is willing to enact. . . .

The third method of avoiding the narrow Senate bottleneck, use of joint resolutions, is apparently the one which is to be used. A Washington dispatch of August 18, 1943, to the *New York Times* states that a majority of the Republican Senators have agreed with the State Department that this method shall be employed. . . .

This device would avoid the use of the word treaties and leave the Senate's treaty-making function to expire quietly or be used only to dispose of the many non-controversial treaties which normally go through the Senate with dispatch. It leaves the possibility of court suits, but this is a minor danger as compared to the frustrations of another Treaty of Versailles debate in the Senate.

If we could believe this declaration—including "the treaty clause never worked once as it was intended"—the United States never has had a treaty with any other

nation! Readers need not be too discerning to be able to discover other equally absurd and extravagant statements in these and other writings from official National Education Association sources.

Nor need there be anxiety lest all this propaganda for world government is being carried on without approval of the rank and file of National Education Association departments whose officers are responsible for preparation and publication of the yearbooks and other printed materials of the departments from which quotations are made in this little book.

At its annual meeting in November, 1948, The National Council for the Social Studies declared by resolution: "Conscious of our obligations as citizens, as students of contemporary problems and events, we the members of The National Council for The Social Studies, resolve that . . . the Council favors the continued support of the United Nations and Unesco, and the furthering at the classroom level of the ideals of these organizations." This action was recalled and re-emphasized in *Social Education* for January, 1949, Page 6; the publication is the official organ of the Council and published in collaboration with the American Historical Association.

Explanation of how the teachers of social studies can implement their intention of furthering the ideals of world government at the classroom level is not hard to find.

Earlier in the year (1948) NEA had published *Education for International Understanding in American Schools*, a book of "suggestions and recommendations," which, according to the "Foreword," is a "book for people who want to do something practical for peace and human progress." The book is "authored" by The Committee on International Relations of NEA,

the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and The National Council for the Social Studies.

Warren Robinson Austin, United States Representative at the Seat of the United Nations, wrote the "Foreword," and begins "pointing up" methods to be used in this revealing paragraph:

Through educational process we must develop a habit of individual thinking about international affairs which will cultivate a sense of public responsibility for the success of the United Nations.

Chapter One, "The Challenge," advances a step further in the final paragraph, Page 10:

This report summons the teaching profession of the United States to unite in planning and executing an educational program for a peaceful world.

In Chapter Three, "The Marks of a World-Minded American," the reader "stumbles upon" a subhead reading, "The world-minded American believes that education can become a powerful force for achieving international understanding and world peace." The same thought is reported in even plainer language on the following page (34), where it is stated that:

Education for international understanding involves the use of education as a force for conditioning the will of the people.

Even before proceeding beyond this point, the reaction of many readers has been that a totalitarian concept has been offered in the suggestion of a "force"

used for "conditioning the will." We can be sure this was no "slip of the pen." The writers surely did not intend to convey the idea of "suggestion" or other milder term, as the word "force" is used repeatedly, and a strong hint of the methods these writers are ready to use appears in the paragraph on Page 35 which reads:

The power of education as a force for world peace can be immense if we carefully define our values and seek to realize them through the techniques we can employ. The power of "education" for war, expressed in terms of inculcating values, can be seen tangibly in the success of Nazi Germany in establishing the ideas of racism and world destiny in the working consciousness of German youth. The world-minded American, therefore, has good reason to believe that education can serve world peace because he believes that world peace has validity as an idea to be striven for.

If the authors have not now made it plain enough that it is not "education" but indoctrination which they propose to use in their program, and that they are willing to use it firmly, relentlessly, even ruthlessly, perhaps the following quotation, from Page 85, should be convincing:

The success of any program of education for international understanding is measured by the extent to which students acquire such attitudes and knowledge, and exercise such abilities in thinking as are requisite to the possession of the marks of a world-minded American. The task of attaining a modification in such a wide range of behavior is far greater than that of gaining in-

tellectual understanding alone. For this reason, the school program must include experiences designed to tap all the sources that go into producing the desired behavior characteristic of the world-minded American. Actual change in behavior is the goal, and any modification in behavior entails changes in attitudes.

For easy "translation" of the foregoing paragraph, and disclosure of what is meant by the expression "experiences designed to tap all the sources that go into producing the desired behavior characteristic," we have but to read the caption over the paragraph as it appears in the book, and reading:

Providing for *Emotional* and Intellectual Assumption of the Responsibilities of the World-Minded American.

As printed in the book, the entire quotation just above is in italics; here only the word "emotional" is italicized, for emphasis. The appeal to the emotions, and the use of the emotions, is inherent in the technique of indoctrination, and the fact, not overlooked by the writers, is important also to the readers of this book written "for people who want to do something practical for peace and human progress."

Some readers of this chapter, particularly if they were impressed by the claims of proponents of the United Nations and not too disappointed by results to date, may ask what all the foregoing has to do with the subject of this book, which is the contributions of National Education Association to the cause of collectivism.

It is true that, by dictionary definition, collectivism is the same as Socialism, and the connection between

the Communist-Socialist movement and the drive for world government may not be immediately apparent to casual observers. But only a small amount of investigation is required to disclose the connection.

Even did no such connection exist—even if all the claims made for world government were *bona fide*—it would have been well worth while to examine the attitude of NEA leaders toward United Nations and more grandiose plans for world government; if the leaders of the nation's greatest professional organization are willing to use extravagances and absurdities in promotion of collectivism in international affairs, it is not surprising if they do the same things in promotion of collectivism in the domestic scene.

In the broad view, if all the sovereignty of the nations of the world, or even some part of the sovereignty of the various nations, were lodged in one world government, certainly this would be a form of collectivism on a world scale.

But it is not alone upon such a generalized statement as the foregoing that we must rely to show a connection between the drive for collectivism in domestic affairs and the programs of the promoters of world super-government. From the outset there have been warnings of the dangers to America, and to civilization, of this connection between domestic and international collectivism.

In July, 1948, issue of *Public Service Magazine*, appeared an article by this present writer, under the too-long but expressive title, "Collectivists Plot Use of United Nations in Scheme for World-Wide Communism." The article showed that Communists, Socialists, and other proponents of collectivism, some of the latter unaware of what their activities really entailed, were seeking to bring about a situation through the

United Nations which they had failed to attain by Constitutional means.

Having failed to secure passage of the Murray-Kilgore Bill (S-380) which was before Congress in 1945, and which had sought to secure for Americans the "benefits" of the unlimited social security schemes of the Britisher, Sir William Beveridge, American collectivists turned their efforts to securing the same ends through an International Declaration of Human Rights.

Such a Declaration was prepared by a Committee on Human Rights of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace for submission to the United Nations. Of the 74 members of the Committee, 43, or five more than a majority, are listed in *Appendix IX* of the House of Representatives Special Committee on Un-American Activities as having from one to forty affiliations each with Communist-Front organizations.

This majority of collectivist-minded members of the Committee surely had "their day" in drafting the preliminary Declaration or Bill of Human Rights, since, under the Bill of Rights, as drafted, the right to *pursue* happiness became the right to *enjoy* all the blessings of comfortable, even luxurious life, and the protected right of all Americans to *seek* employment became the right to *have* a well-paid job at the expense of the public treasury, if and when it appears that no jobs in private employment are available at the moment.

It was pointed out in the article that under the Constitution, treaties of our nation are part of our basic laws (second paragraph of Article IV) and that were such a Bill of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations and ratified by the United States Senate, the Bill of Rights would be a treaty, and as such, supplant any statutes or even Constitutional provisions in conflict with that Bill of Rights.

In support of this writer's position, the Supreme Court decision in *Missouri v. Holland* in 1920 was cited. In this decision the Court ruled that Congress may enact statutes to carry out treaty obligations, even where, in the absence of such a treaty, the Congress has no Constitutional authority to enact such a statute.

Some months later, two special committees of the American Bar Association sounded this same warning, but without effect. The United Nations did adopt a Universal Declaration of Human Rights on December 10, 1948, and by Senate action, it was given American approval.

"Came the deluge." The California Appellate Court set aside land laws of the state on the ground that they were in conflict with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights! Of course, the Supreme Court of the state, and perhaps also the United States Supreme Court, must pass upon the Appellate Court's decision, but it is all too clear that the warnings sounded in advance were not mere figments of imagination.

In other ways, too, even the timid approaches to world super-government made through the United Nations constitute grave danger to the liberties of Americans. Following are Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article XXIX of the Universal Declaration as they appear on Page 267 of *The American Citizens Handbook*, 1951 edition, a publication of National Education Association:

2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Yes, National Education Association publishes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but gives no sign of recognition of what it all means, no indication of awareness of the thinly disguised traps in the two paragraphs quoted above.

Does Paragraph 2 read like the Bill of Rights which is incorporated in our American Constitution? After the rights of Freedom of Religion, Speech, Press, Assembly and Petition are declared in Amendment I, and guaranteed by denying to Congress the right to make any law restricting or limiting them, does the Amendment continue with a declaration that these rights "shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law?" Certainly not.

And since the Universal Declaration *does* so continue, it is a self-disclosed, self-confessed fraud. Just as principle cannot be compromised, so liberty cannot be divided or limited. When liberty is subject to the will or whim of some un-named legislative body, not yet created, but dreamed of by proponents of world super-government, it is liberty no longer, but merely a temporary grant or permission.

International law, as it is visioned by these dreamers, is law passed by a world legislature and enforced by a world executive with an international army at his command. With six per cent of the world population, will America elect that world legislature or that world executive with an international army to do his bidding?

Looking now at Paragraph 3, quoted above, we find another frankly expressed limitation. And this limitation is without limitation! For when Paragraph 3 de-

clares that "these rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations," it stops right there: it does not say who is to be judge of what rights and freedoms might conceivably be in conflict with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, nor does it even intimate that there might be a limit to these "purposes and principles" as they might be expanded by some future legislative body chosen by a world in which America has but six per cent of the population.

Certainly Chapter XIV of the United Nations Charter, which sets up the International Court of Justice, offers nothing which appears to be a guarantee that the Court actually will be a Court of Justice. And even if some such guarantee were expressed or implied, the guarantee would be worthless because the court is not the sole and exclusive arbiter of disputes between nations, even though all the nations involved in or party to the dispute or difference are members of the United Nations.

Article 95 of Chapter XIV provides that "Nothing in the present Charter shall prevent Members of the United Nations from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence *or which may be concluded in the future.*" (Italics added.)

Thus it is clear that if a nation did not get the judgment it desired from the International Court of Justice, or feared that it might not, the case could be taken to some other court.

Americans need not, in fact should not, base their opposition to world super-government, or even to the present United Nations, on the ground that in such a world government America would be impoverished if not actually ravaged in the end.

Rather, opposition should be based upon the fact that America nurtures and is the sole custodian of an infinitely precious thing, the concept of liberty based upon the premise that man was created to be free. This concept is accepted by no other nation, no other people in the world. Some may approach the concept, but none give full and complete acceptance to it; in every other nation the people cling to the old and outworn fetish that the state is an entity with power to grant liberties to its subjects.

America cannot share this concept with the world through such an agency as the United Nations, a world super-government, or any other type of agency or organization.

America can remain the hope of the world for universal liberty only if she stands firm upon the basic concepts of American government, and invites other nations to follow her example and make freedom an actuality rather than something to be desired but hardly to be attained.

National Education Association has shown all too clearly that it understands none of this philosophy of American liberty. Until it does begin to understand what American liberty really means, it is unworthy of the confidence of American lovers of liberty.

IX

JOHN DEWEY'S PHILOSOPHY
"IN A NUTSHELL"

Published writings of authorized spokesmen for The National Education Association make it clear that NEA is just as firmly committed to the principles of progressive education as is the Progressive Education Association.

John Dewey's statement "My Pedagogic Creed," is published in Personal Growth Leaflet No. 19; a copy of the seventh printing of this leaflet gives the total number of copies printed as 466,500.

Joy Elmer Morgan, editor of *The Journal of the National Education Association*, wrote the preface for this little NEA publication. He wrote in part:

The great moments in history are not the ones the historians usually set down. Rather they are the moments when ideas are born and grow into ideals or inventions. The birth of an idea such as the brotherhood of man or the Golden Rule is more important than the rise and fall of the Roman Empire. . . . Particularly significant in the advance of democratic institutions are those times when ideas come to be stated in terms that the multitude can grasp. It was this service that Horace Mann performed for the free public school, and Lincoln for the Civil War. We have forgotten most of the details of the Civil War, but the Gettysburg Address lives on and will live so long

as men cherish the ideal of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

And so we have John Dewey profoundly to thank for drafting the emancipation proclamation of childhood, in a philosophy which demands that children shall live and learn happily and well according to their needs and interests today as the best preparation for worthy lives tomorrow. "My Pedagogic Creed," first published in 1897, is as important for the pedagogical revolution now taking place in America as Paine's "Common Sense" was for the political revolution of 1776. The professional bible of every teacher may well include this compact statement which seems almost inspired in its simplicity.

Simplicity of expression is a most worthy goal toward which all too few writers strive; and of those who strive, not too many attain the desired end. Perhaps Dr. Dewey's progress toward that end could be best illustrated from some of his preliminary paragraphs, but to save both time and space, we will plunge directly into his discussion of what the school is. Quoting:

I believe that the school is primarily a social institution. Education being a social process, the school is simply that form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated that will be most effective in bringing the child to share in the inherited resources of the race, and to use his own powers for social ends. . . .

The school, as an institution, should simplify existing social life; should reduce it, as it were, to an embryonic form. Existing life is so complex that the child cannot be brought into contact with it without either confusion or distraction; he

is either overwhelmed by the multiplicity of activities which are going on, so that he loses his own power of orderly reaction, or he is so stimulated by these various activities that his powers are prematurely called into play and he becomes either unduly specialized or else disintegrated. . . .

Much of present education fails because it neglects this fundamental principle of the school as a form of community life. It conceives the school as a place where certain information is to be given, where certain lessons are to be learned, or where certain habits are to be formed. The value of these is conceived as lying largely in the remote future; the child must do these things for the sake of something else he is to do; they are mere preparations. As a result they do not become a part of the life experience of the child and so are not truly educative.

Now that we know what Dr. Dewey's conception of the school is, and can appreciate how lacking of true education persons of the older generations really are, we can proceed to examination of the good doctor's view as to the place of the teacher in the school. Quoting:

The teacher is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences.

The discipline of the school should proceed from the life of the school as a whole and not directly from the teacher.

The teacher's business is simply to determine, on the basis of larger experience and riper wis-

dom, how the discipline of life shall come to the child.

All questions of the grading of the child and his promotion should be determined by reference to the same standard. Examinations are of use only so far as they test the child's fitness for social life and reveal the place in which he can be of the most service and where he can receive the most help.

Persons of the older generation may wonder how they have gotten along as well as they have in view of the fact that their teachers fell so far short in so many regards, as per the Dewey viewpoint. But perhaps they can take some comfort from the fact that although the Dewey philosophy has been favored by top-notch educators and "injected" into the school systems of the nation as completely as possible for more than a half-century, by no means all the nation's schools have adopted the Dewey brand of progressive education. We proceed now to the Dewey statement relative to the subject matter of education. Quoting:

I believe that the social life of the child is the basis of concentration, or correlation, in all his training or growth. The social life gives the unconscious unity and the background of all his efforts and of all his attainments.

The subject matter of the school curriculum should mark a gradual differentiation out of the primitive unconscious unity of social life.

We violate the child's nature and render difficult the best ethical results by introducing the child too abruptly to a number of special studies, of reading, writing, geography, etc., out of relation to this social life.

The true center of correlation on the school

subject is not science, nor literature, nor history, nor geography, but the child's own social activities.

Education cannot be unified in the study of science, or so-called nature study, because apart from human activity, nature itself is not a unity; nature in itself is a number of diverse objects in space and time, and to attempt to make it the center of work by itself is to introduce a principle of radiation rather than one of concentration.

Literature is the reflex expression and interpretation of social experience; that hence it must follow upon and not precede such experience. It, therefore, cannot be made the basis, although it may be made the summary of unification.

Once more that history is of educative value in so far as it presents phases of social life and growth. It must be controlled by reference to social life. When taken simply as history it is thrown into the distant past and becomes dead and inert. Taken as the record of man's social life and progress it becomes full of meaning. I believe, however, that it cannot be so taken excepting as the child is also introduced directly into social life.

The primary basis of education is in the child's powers at work along the same general constructive lines as those which have brought civilization into being.

The only way to make the child conscious of his social heritage is to enable him to perform those fundamental types of activity which make civilization what it is.

In the so-called expressive or constructive activities is the center of correlation.

This gives the standard for the place of cooking, sewing, manual training, etc., in the school.

They are not special studies which are to be in-

troduced over and above a lot of others in the way of relaxation or relief, or as additional accomplishments. I believe rather that they represent, as types, fundamental forms of social activity; and that it is possible and desirable that the child's introduction into the more formal subjects of the curriculum be thru the medium of these constructive activities.

The study of science is educational in so far as it brings out the materials and processes which make social life what it is.

One of the greatest difficulties in the present teaching of science is that the material is presented in purely objective form, or is treated as a new peculiar kind of experience which the child can add to that which he has already had. In reality, science is of value because it gives the ability to interpret and control the experience already had. It should be introduced, not as so much new subject matter, but as showing the factors already involved in previous experience and as furnishing tools by which that experience can be more easily and effectively regulated.

Not the least of the interesting things about education which can be "learned" from the foregoing is the fact that domestic science and manual training courses in the schools are not for the purpose of giving students an opportunity to work with their hands and learn to do things which will be of value to them in later life, but merely for the purpose of introducing the child to those sterner studies which the progressive educators must at least pretend to include in the school curriculum.

To this present writer it is something of a shock to "learn" that what he learned of mathematics, physics, chemistry and biology in school had no relation to the

material things of life, but in some way prepared this not-over-eager student for his later contacts with "social life."

As a matter of fact, this writer has made considerable use of the mathematics he learned in school, and it has been a source of continuing satisfaction that what he learned in the sciences have given him the answer to the questions "Why?" and "How?" regarding hundreds and thousands of phenomena which he has witnessed during the past half-century.

But to this day he is unable to see how these things have any connection with the quirks and turns of social-economic developments as he has witnessed them. For example, this writer might wonder what it was that he failed to learn in his studies of mathematics and other sciences that would help to explain the all-too-general acceptance of the fallacy that nations can spend themselves into prosperity and affluence.

By way of summing up, Dr. Dewey continues:

Education must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience; that the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing.

Dr. Dewey leaves the reader without explanation of how the process and goal of education can be one and the same thing. This writer is unconvinced; if learning to skate or to swim is the same as skating or swimming, or if building a house is the same as a house, then in this writer's humble opinion, language has lost its meaning.

Another section of Dr. Dewey's address is given over to dissertation on "The Nature of Method." In the course of this discussion he declares:

The image is the great instrument of instruction. What a child gets out of any subject presented to him is simply the images which he himself forms with regard to it.

If nine-tenths of the energy at present directed towards making the child learn certain things were spent in seeing to it that the child was forming proper images, the work of instruction would be indefinitely facilitated.

Much of the time and attention now given to the preparation and presentation of lessons might be more wisely and profitably expended in training the child's power of imagery and in seeing to it that he was continually forming definite vivid and growing images of the various subjects with which he comes in contact in his experience.

Again we follow the lead of Dr. Dewey and leave the reader to make what he can out of the three foregoing paragraphs, and proceed to present Dr. Dewey's thoughts on "The School and Social Progress":

I believe that education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform.

All reforms which rest simply upon the enactment of law, or the threatening of certain penalties, or upon changes in mechanical or outward arrangements, are transitory and futile.

Education is a regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness; and that the adjustment of individual activity on the basis of this social consciousness is the only sure method of social reconstruction.

This conception has due regard for both the individualistic and socialistic ideals. It is duly individual because it recognizes the formation of a certain character as the only genuine basis of right living. It is socialistic because it recognizes that

this right character is not to be formed by merely individual precept, example, or exhortation, but rather by the influence of a certain form of institutional or community life upon the individual, and that the social organism thru the school, as its organ, may determine ethical results.

In the ideal school we have the reconciliation of the individualistic and the institutional ideals.

The community's duty to education is, therefore, its paramount moral duty. By law and punishment, by social agitation and discussion, society can regulate and form itself in a more or less haphazard and chance way. But thru education society can formulate its own purposes, can organize its own means and resources, and thus shape itself with definiteness and economy in the direction in which it wishes to move.

When society once recognizes the possibilities in this direction, and the obligations which these possibilities impose, it is impossible to conceive of the resources of time, attention, and money which will be put at the disposal of the educator. . . .

The teacher is engaged, not simply in the training of individuals, but in the formation of the proper social life.

Every teacher should realize the dignity of his calling; that he is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth.

In this way the teacher always is the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God.

To this writer it would be surprising if a great many of the readers of the foregoing were not revolted by this "in a nutshell" presentation of the Dewey philosophy.

If he did not previously possess it, the reader has

before him the genesis of the progressive education idea that the ego of the child who lacks the ability or the will to study and understand must not be "bruised" by subjecting him to comparison of results he has attained with the objectives reached by his classmates. Therefore he must not be subjected to examination as to the nature and amount of his accomplishments; above all, he must not be allowed to "fail"; whether or not he has comprehended anything whatever of the subject matter presented to him during a semester or year, he must "progress" with his own age group into a higher grade.

In other words, he must not be trained to take part in a competitive system; were he so trained he might get false ideas about "equality of men." To this writer it would appear that the only rational basis for training students to live in a type of society entirely different from the one in which they are to live, would be that the educators believe that their efforts in the direction of "formation of the proper social life" will have almost immediate effect, and that Utopia is "just around the corner."

Such a conclusion hardly seems justified on the part of Editor Morgan and other educators of today in view of the fact that the Dewey philosophy was expounded more than 50 years ago, and our social-economic life remains largely competitive in its nature.

Since these "progressive" ideas are so repugnant to so many people, we may wonder how the educators promoting them have advanced as far as they have. It is not "done with mirrors"; rather it is done by evasion, subterfuge and double-talk.

When the progressive education system and its results are challenged, proponents of the system do not meet the criticisms directly. Rather, they dodge and

evade; they declare that the critics lack the educational or other background which would qualify them to discuss such matters, or they quickly turn a few verbal handsprings and direct the train of thought into other channels.

We turn to Section G, final section—except for “Postscript”—of Part II of *True Faith and Allegiance*, an elaborate booklet published by the Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education of National Education Association. The scene is the meeting place of the Cyclic Club as the members are gathering for their luncheon session.

The president of the club exchanges greetings with the superintendent of schools, and then asks him, “Do you really believe in Progressive Education?” And the superintendent replies:

“I believe in *good* education, and so when what people call progressive education is good, and it very often is, I believe in it. When any other kind of education is good, I believe in it. When it’s bad, I don’t believe in it. How’s that?”

Of course this is quibbling; the superintendent’s answer has none of the characteristics of a straight answer to a fair question. But the club president is “caught off balance,” and allows the conversation to be shifted promptly to unrelated subjects.

Cynical readers, and some not so cynical, will understand that this conversation is printed in this book as a “straight tip” to teachers and supervisors of teachers as to how they can best meet questions and criticisms about the Dewey philosophy of “progressive education.”

X

AN OVER-ALL VIEW OF NEA

Looking forward to the centennial of the National Education Association, founded in Philadelphia in 1857, the Representative Assembly of the Association, meeting in San Francisco in 1951, adopted a seven-year program of further development of the Association's power and influence.

Among the stated aims of the Centennial Action Program is increase of the number of affiliated local associations to 6,000, and general adoption of the unified dues plan. Under this plan a single membership fee, collected at the local level, pays the assessed-to-members costs of local, state, national and world service. A natural result would be to bring practically all teachers in America into NEA membership.

Tremendous progress toward the goal of 100 per cent affiliation has been made in the last eleven years. From 1921 to 1941 the number of affiliated locals increased from 197 to 892. The (percentage) rate of increase practically doubled during the next decade; on May 31, 1952, the Association had 4,400 affiliates on the local level.

On the state level, every one of the 48 states had an affiliated association, and affiliated associations of equal rank existed in Alaska, District of Columbia, Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The estimated number of teachers in public elementary and secondary schools in the 52 "states" during the 1950-51 school year was 1,040,578. Membership

in the affiliated state-level associations as of May 31, 1952, totaled 952,577. On the same date the membership roll of National Education Association numbered 490,968; the roll had more than doubled in the preceding decade.

On the basis of numbers, National Education Association is the most powerful organization of professional people in the nation, hence an extremely potent pressure group in the political field.

Proponents of socialized medicine declare that American Medical Association is the most powerful pressure group in America; it numbers 147,565.¹

If all clergymen with charges in the United States (181,123)² could be enrolled in a professional society; and if all American attorneys (181,226)³ could be enrolled in the American Bar Association; and if the three organizations representing all doctors, lawyers and preachers could be federated, this federation would barely match NEA's membership of 490,968.

Of course when NEA's lobbyists go to Congress with demands for legislation, the emphasis is on the 952,577 members of the affiliates.

The Representative Assembly of 3,300 delegates from affiliated associations is the policy-making body and determines the legislative program. The Board of Directors numbers 78; the Board of Trustees has five members, and eleven members serve on the Executive Committee.

Carrying out the various activities of National Education Association are 29 departments, 24 commissions and committees, 14 headquarters divisions and one council.

¹ *World Almanac*, 1953.

² *Yearbook of American Churches*, National Council of Churches, 1952.

³ U. S. Census, 1950.

Headquarters of NEA are in a handsome office building at 1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C., purchased by the Association in 1920 and enlarged in 1930. This building houses the offices of the association and its committees and commissions, and 19 of the 29 departments. The Association's employes number an average of 458; the annual payroll for 1951-52 was approximately \$1,610,000.

Membership fees, totaling \$3,500,000 in the year 1951-52, account for approximately 65 per cent of the total income of the Association; receipts from all sources were in excess of \$5,388,000 during that fiscal year.

The regular membership fee of \$5.00 per year confers the normal and usual privileges of voting, office holding and attendance at meetings, and each member receives the nine issues of *The Journal* which are published each year.

Members may pay \$10.00 per year if they wish, and these "special" members also receive the Association's *Research Bulletins* and the Association annual, *The Volume of Addresses and Proceedings*, which is a permanent record of the annual convention.

Life membership costs \$150.00, but this amount may be paid in ten equal annual installments if desired. Life members receive the same publications to which the \$10.00 "special" members are entitled.

Receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets and leaflets amount to a tidy sum. The exact amount is not stated in the *NEA Handbook*, from which the information in preceding paragraphs of this chapter were gleaned, but it is declared that 24,000 orders accompanied by remittances were received during the year, and more than 46,500 statements totaling more than \$570,000 were handled by the department of accounts.

The *Handbook*, 384 pages in paper covers, sells for \$1.00. The 1952-53 issue bears the date, August, 1952. The number of copies printed is 30,000. Copies were sent to presidents of local associations and presidents and secretaries of state associations, and their departments; officers of the NEA and its subdivisions, and delegates to the Representative Assembly at Detroit; to \$10.00 institutional members of NEA; county and city superintendents; presidents of universities and colleges, including teachers colleges; deans of schools of education, and rural state supervisors.

Only a glance at the *Publications List* of National Education Association is enough to assure that NEA believes in the power of the printed word.

The *List* published under date of April, 1951, is a booklet of 36 pages; the page size is 5½ by 7¼ inches. Listed in the booklet are 772 publications, exclusive of periodicals. Prices range from two cents to \$5.00 per copy; a few are free. To purchase one copy of each of the publications listed, including the subscription prices of those periodicals which are available to the public, would cost \$488.28.

Sponsorship of the publications by the various commissions, committees departments and divisions of NEA is shown in the second section of the *Publications List*. In the first section the publications are listed by subject.

To indicate the extent of publication sponsorship by the various subsidiaries of NEA, a list of these groups is presented here. The name of each group will be followed by the number, and sometimes other information about periodicals and other publications sponsored, with the total of single-copy prices for each group. The number of publications as stated does not include the number of periodicals, but the total cost

of one copy each of the group's publications includes the price, if any, of an annual subscription to the periodicals. The list follows:

Commissions

Educational Policies Commission, 14 publications, of which two are free; \$9.95.

National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Thru Education, 14; 11 free; \$1.00.

National Commission on Safety Education, mimeographed newsletter sent to selected list; 31 publications, one free; \$12.65.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, one periodical (quarterly); seven publications, one free; \$5.75.

National Council on Teacher Retirement, six, one free; \$1.65.

Committees

Citizenship, six publications; \$2.75.

Credit Unions, two; fifty cents.

International Relations, four; \$2.50.

Professional Ethics, two; fifty cents.

Tax Education and School Finance, eight; \$2.35.

Tenure and Academic Freedom, 24, two free; \$7.10.

NEA and American Medical Association (Joint Committee), two; \$3.15.

Departments

Adult Education, one periodical, free to members; 11, three free; \$3.90.

American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, one periodical, free to members;

one periodical, \$3.00; 58 publications, seven free; \$35.58.

American Association of School Administrators, 28, of which 22 are *Yearbooks*; \$48.50.

American Educational Research Association, one periodical, \$5.00; 18 publications; \$28.75.

American Industrial Arts Association, one periodical, no information given.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Department, one periodical, \$3.50; 20 publications; \$30.05.

Audio-Visual Instruction, one periodical; \$3.00.

Classroom Teachers, News Bulletin, free to local associations; 27 publications, 11 free; \$5.05.

Elementary School Principals, one periodical, free to members; 34 publications; \$38.10.

Higher Education, one periodical, \$3.00; five; \$8.75.

International Council for Exceptional Children, one periodical, free to members.

Music Educators National Conference, one periodical, \$1.50; complete list of publications available at Chicago office.

National Association of Deans of Women, one periodical, \$3.00; nine publications; \$6.90.

National Association of Secondary-School Principals, one periodical, free to members; 72 publications, two free; \$65.25.

National Council for the Social Studies, one periodical; \$3.00; 40 other publications, of which seven are *Yearbooks*; \$36.00.

The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, one periodical, free to members; list of publications available on request.

National School Public Relations Association, two

periodicals, free to members; seven publications; 95 cents.

National Science Teachers Association, nine; \$4.50.

Rural Education, 23 publications, of which eight are Yearbooks, \$17.75.

Speech Association of America, one periodical, \$3.50.

United Business Education Association, two periodicals, one \$3.00, one free; 20 publications, \$13.15.

Divisions

Legislative-Federal Relations, news letter, free; three; 55 cents.

Press and Radio Relations, 14, two free; \$10.65.

Publication, *The Journal*, free to members, 50 cents per copy to others; *NEA News*, sent to selected list; 22 publications; \$22.35.

Personal Growth Leaflets, 140 kept in print; \$2.80.¹

Research, 34 publications, one free; \$32.15.

Research Bulletin, periodical, \$2.00; 51 publications; \$18.75.

Most important of National Education Association periodicals is *The Journal*. It is handsome and well edited with page size similar to that of the weekly news magazines such as *Time*, *News Week* and *Pathfinder*. It is available in many libraries, presumably through some sort of associate membership.

Editorially, of course, *The Journal* reflects the policies of NEA. The "masthead" page carries the usual declaration that signed articles on following pages represent the opinions of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the editorial policies of *The Journal*. Only the

¹ According to *NEA Handbook*, 1952-53, a total of 46,382,832 of these leaflets have been published.

extremely naive will believe that the editors select for publication signed articles representing viewpoints with which they are in disagreement.

Both the editorial and "news" columns of *The Journal* support the policies of the so-called progressive education, based in godless pragmatism, and one of the basic and immediate evils of which is the training of children for life in a non-competitive world, though the teachers well know that the world in which the children will live when they leave school is a highly competitive world.

In the January, 1950, issue of *The Journal* appears an article by Dr. Margaret Lindsey, coördinator of professional education at Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind. The article, on Page 26, explaining "How the child can participate in appraisal of the school program," reads in part:

According to Willard C. Olson, *NEA Journal*, September, 1947, the purpose of the school program should be to "assist (each) child to grow according to his natural design without deprivation or forcing in an environment which also supplies social direction to his achievements."

The educational program designed to reach this goal will have, among other characteristics, the following: . . .

(2) An atmosphere (a) conducive to socially—intergrated behavior—good human relationships, (b) free from rigidity, (c) *free from competition*, (d) free from fear—especially fear created by adults' expectations beyond a child's ability.

The phrase, "free from competition," in the last quoted paragraph above, was italicized by this writer

for emphasis. When the article by Dr. Olson was published in 1947, he was touted as "foremost in his field"; he is a member of the faculty of the University of Michigan.

Editorial support of *The Journal* was immediate and emphatic when National Education Association decided to accept the challenge of Dr. George S. Counts of Columbia University, in his pamphlet, "*Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?*" (Published in 1932 as a John Day pamphlet.)

As was related in the first chapter of this present little book, the report of the six-man committee appointed to draft the *Desirable Social-Economic Goals of America* was published in the January, 1934, issue of *The Journal*.

John Dewey's godless philosophy (pragmatism) appears clearly in the "prologue" of the *Goals* statement when it declares that the national policies in the social-economic field must be judged, not by whether or not they "square" with the moral law, but with the results that can be obtained. Quoting the "prologue:"

Social and economic policies and practices must be judged by what they do to enrich the lives of individuals. Therefore the desirable social-economic goals of America are stated in terms of the things we covet in the highest degree for the largest number of Americans.

Arrogance of the NEA leaders in presenting *Desirable Goals of America* rather than recommendations to America or for America surely is worthy of note.

Joy Elmer Morgan, editor of *The Journal*, lost no time in giving editorial endorsement to the committee report. As editor of *The Journal*, he had prior access to the document which was to be published in the NEA

official organ, and he was able to scoop all other editors and get the editorial "flowers" into the columns of the same issue in which the report was published. Here is what he wrote:

Let every teacher make himself a student of these social-economic goals and interpret them to the people. . . . The school must learn to value and cultivate the adult mind as well as the child mind. The high school must become again the people's college. Citizens everywhere must be led to study, to understand and to debate again the issues and ideals of American democracy. They must be led to use the enriched resources which are now available for the building of a culture which will arouse the enthusiasm and devotion of the people. Democratic civilization is at stake.

Here is complete endorsement of the program, including its "prologue"; here is statement of the top-level decree that the schools must become propaganda tools for the collectivists; finally, here is further, and total, preoccupation with godless democracy, forsaking our American Republic, government based in moral law.

Taking a fling at book reviewing, Editor Morgan wrote an editorial for the December, 1945, issue of *The Journal*, in which he said some extremely complimentary things about a book he had read and could not resist recommending as "the most important book of the year." In the editorial Dr. Morgan wrote:

We name as the most important book of the year *Sixty Million Jobs* by Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce. The book "gives not

only the WHY but also the HOW, the time-table and the balance sheets for both the immediate program and the long-range goals." . . . It deserves a place in every school library and should be part of the required study of every high school and college student. It may well furnish the basis for discussion groups in home, church and school.

Actually the book was, and is, "strictly crackpot," in the true Wallace tradition, but served the useful (for Wallace) purpose as the "kick off" for his nomination, in 1948, as the Presidential candidate of the Communist-dominated Progressive Party.

The Wallace book is "crackpot" rather than truly subversive because it promises everything to everybody, whereas a subversive (Communist) program promises only spoils to the spoilers.

In *Sixty Million Jobs* the author promises that his program can be made to provide lower taxes while offering additional government services in housing, education, resources development (public power, rural electrification, soil conservation, etc.) and "extending social security and health insurance by universal coverage for unemployment and old-age insurance, by universal health insurance and adequate medical facilities, and expanded public-health service."

While "maintaining prices of farm products" and "maintaining wages to protect take-home pay" (requiring higher wage rates) Wallace promises to "adjust industrial prices to promote consumption," meaning lower prices. It wouldn't be "done with mirrors," but by government spending, subsidy and "planning."

Of course *The Journal* editor was not the only one to "go all ga-ga" about this "crackpot" book. Laudatory reviews appeared in *New Republic*, *Saturday Review of Literature*, the *Nation* (review by Stuart

Chase) and other publications which always laud collectivist maudlinisms.

The *New York Times* Book Review Section presented a symposium, with a laudatory review by U. S. Senator Claude Pepper of Florida, and an adverse critique by U. S. Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio. *Book Review Digest* published this significant paragraph from the Taft review:

Mr. Wallace states well the ideal conditions which we would all like to see brought about in America. His book stimulates thought and study to find the right way to obtain them. But his own plans can only lead to another very artificial boom followed by the depression and unemployment he is trying to avoid. In his failure he is likely to destroy the whole American system of freedom which has made this people the most powerful nation the world has ever seen, and already with the highest standard of living and prosperity.

Had this present writer been editor of *Book Review Digest*, he would have chosen for publication this paragraph from the Taft review:

Mr. Wallace's book is full of pious reverence for private enterprise as an institution, but scorn for most business men. But, on page after page, he introduces government enterprise on a scale that would destroy free enterprise. . . . Henry Wallace's fallacy is his belief that the private enterprise machine can be run simply by pouring in more gasoline while you drop monkey wrenches into the machinery trying to adjust and repair it.

But no amount of excoriation or exposure of the book would have halted its successful march into the

schools on the recommendation of National Education Association's editorial spokesman.

In a midwestern city in the fall of 1951, a library patron who sought to refresh his memories of the *Sixty Million Jobs*, was told that the city library no longer had a copy, but that each of the three branch libraries in the three high schools of the city had copies. Books like this are given to adolescents, and it is called "teaching economics."

Naturally, *The Journal* reflects the opposition of NEA to Universal Military Training or any form of conscription. (Typical editorials appear in January, 1945, and April, 1946, issues.)

Equally emphatic is NEA opposition to any and every movement seeking to limit taxing power, the most easily available and most efficient tool of the collectivist forces hell-bent for the Socialist Utopia. An editorial in issue of December, 1944, declares that acceptance of proposals to place limits on federal taxing power would be equivalent to signing away the birth-right of the people!

Certainly nobody can deny that National Education Association has been the leading and principal proponent of federal aid to education. But to make the record complete and show the exact terminology now being used and the relative importance of the demand on the NEA legislative program, it is noted that the November, 1952, issue of *The Journal* publishes the Association's Federal Legislative Policy statement "as defined in the NEA Platform and 1952 Resolutions." First on the list:

The National Education Association advocates:
Financial assistance from the federal government to the states, territories, possessions, and

District of Columbia for support of public education.

Federal funds provided with the understanding that the expenditure of such funds and the shaping of educational policies be matters of state and local control.

Of course some supporters of the federal aid proposals will continue to claim that suggested measures are not socialistic. The point is being argued publicly and privately all over the nation, and the arguments need not be presented here.

Surely it cannot be denied that the proposal is in the direction of statism—concentration of state power; by its very nature the proposal means that further responsibilities for levying and distributing taxes would devolve upon the federal government, which has no money except what it takes from the citizens.

And what a farce it would be for the federal government to take money from the citizens of a state, return a fraction of it to the schools of that state, and call it federal aid!

Also significant on the point as to whether or not federal aid to education would be in the direction of statism, we might consider the pretty little foible of NEA in suggesting that the federal aid shall be given outright to the states, or to the schools of the states, without any measure of federal control.

It is not a little difficult to understand a mentality which assumes that such a thing could happen, if indeed anybody so assumes: it is just as true now as it always has been that he who pays the fiddler calls the tune, and that any other concept would be completely out of line with American ideas of realism, equity and justice.

This is the way federal aid really works: the federal government levies a sales tax on gasoline, thus

collecting revenues from a special class of taxpayers. These revenues are distributed to states which are willing to improve highways which will fit into the federal highway system.

The federal control is absolute. The engineering is under federal direction; contracts with construction firms must be approved by the federal government's chosen agencies; every step of construction is under constant federal inspection; the contractor will not be paid until the work has been approved and the accounts have been audited by representatives of the federal authority. No other course would be realistic, or equitable.

If Congress ever does enact a measure providing federal aid to education, the money will be paid only to those schools which meet qualifications prescribed by the U. S. Office of Education, and which will agree to spend the money in a manner to suit the bureaucratic will.

Naturally, *The Journal* is committed, 100 per cent, to the policy of advocating—yes, propagandizing for—world super-government. This position of National Education Association is discussed at considerable length in the chapter, "Promoting International Collectivism." For the purpose of this over-all view of the Association, no more is necessary than a look at the most recent official pronouncements and a glimpse and hint of the propaganda methods used.

In *The Journal* for April, 1951, Page 243, are published the resolutions adopted by the American Association of School Administrators at the Association's annual meeting, Feb. 17-23, 1951. Quoting:

United Nations. We urge continued use of the United Nations as an instrument of peace. We

declare ourselves in favor of charter amendment to enable the United Nations to enact, interpret *and enforce* world law to prevent war. . . .

Since the United Nations is the tangible, organized expression of mankind's desire for peace, all schools should coöperate in supporting United Nations Education Service to be inaugurated by NEA in September, 1951.

Italics were added to the words "and enforce" for attention and emphasis, for these words make it clear that this powerful group within NEA suggests insuring peace by setting up a world army to wage major wars in suppression of any minor wars which might develop. We may well wonder how much consideration those educators have given to this problem; just how safe will be the cherished liberties of Americans under such a set-up? Our liberties are based in moral laws not recognized by 94 per cent of the people of the world; have those advocates of peace through operation of a world army given any consideration whatever to this fact?

Illustrating the propaganda methods of the pedagogic proponents of world super-government, in October, 1950, issue of *The Journal*, Page 491, is devoted to a picture of a small girl sewing a United Nations flag. In *large* letters, the picture is captioned, "Betsy Ross—1950." The cut lines read:

On United Nations Day, October 23, many schools will present a UN flag to each classroom. Others will encourage children to make their own flags, as seven-year-old Patti Reid is doing here. For information on instructions and materials, see Page 544. Suggestions for teaching about the UN throughout the year are given on Page 492.

Cover page illustration of *NEA Journal* for March, 1953, is a reproduction of a color photograph of a group of elementary school children at Laurel School, Los Angeles, California; the children are shown with hands over hearts, presumably repeating the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag; Old Glory is prominently in the foreground and no flag of United Nations was within camera range.

Was this photo selected, perhaps, to offset some of the nationwide publicity concerning events when Los Angeles citizens inaugurated a movement which resulted in removing UNESCO "citizenship courses" from the school's curriculum? Was *NEA Journal* "telling the world" that NEA is not guilty of anything against which citizens might rebel—that it recommends teaching only American ideals of patriotism?

First principal feature of this March issue is a full-page editorial captioned "The Outlook for America," signed by Joy Elmer Morgan, editor. First part of the editorial is repetition of the fears of the tax-and-spend advocates that possible halt of hostilities and defense spending may bring about a depression; it is the same "tune" which was the basis of the Henry Wallace book for which Editor Morgan showed so much appreciation.

This more modern version conveniently forgets what happened when the nation was converted from war production to peace production in the middle 1940's. The three final paragraphs of the editorial read:

We who teach are concerned with more basic questions than either war or depression. Our task concerns people and the building of purpose, intelligence, skill, and character in their lives. The eternal struggle between good and evil is now

global, but the issues at stake are the age-old issues with which mankind has struggled from the beginning: faith versus doubt, hope versus despair, truth versus error, right versus wrong, freedom versus tyranny, love versus violence.

The worldwide aspiration and hunger for a better life should strengthen our faith in the future. Our generation is the first in human history that ever dared to believe it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race.

Let us inspire our people to look to the future, as our forefathers did before us, with faith in ourselves, in our country, in humanity, and in God.

Even casual reading of this effusion discloses that Editor Morgan is engaging in double talk which seeks to convince readers that world super-government is just around the corner and will make the earth a giant Utopia. Even if this conclusion is right, his premises are wrong. The eternal struggle between good and evil has not just now become a global problem; it is a human problem dating back to beginnings of the race, and it spread over the world as humanity populated larger and larger sections of Mother Earth.

Nor is our generation the first in human history to believe it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race.

The process of offering worldly as well as spiritual benefits to all people of the world began when Jesus Christ sent his disciples out to spread the glad tidings. Christians always have been mission-minded, and their missionaries always have taught better ways of physical living as well as spiritual development.

Christianity is the most individualistic of all religions, and as individuals were given more and more

freedom to develop their possibilities, civilization advanced, reaching its highest plane in the United States, founded on the principles enunciated in the Preamble of the Declaration of Independence, but borrowed from the *New Testament*.

By example, by sending Christian missionaries to all parts of the world, and in other ways, Americans always have shown willingness to help people of other nations to seek and find the spiritual and material benefits to free government founded on the principles of the Christian faith.

If declarations of Editor Morgan are not enough to prove that NEA proposes to continue as an exponent of the theories of world government, plenty of other evidence is at hand.

NEA's Educational Policies Commission prepared and sponsored publication of an eight-page pamphlet (with cover) titled, *The United Nations, Unesco, and American Schools*; it bears the date, December, 1952.

In defense of its position, the Commission argues in this way: American citizens were favorable toward establishment of United Nations; America joined UN as result of an overwhelming vote in the U. S. Senate; later, a number of specialized agencies of UN were set up, among them UNESCO, and both houses of Congress acted almost unanimously in approving the Constitution of UNESCO and making the United States a member; hence UN and UNESCO must be all that could be desired and operating strictly in conformance with the UN Charter and UNESCO Constitution. It is pointed out that by its Constitution, UNESCO is forbidden to engage in propaganda for world government, and the assumption is that UNESCO is faithful to its trust.

School children should be taught *about* UN and

UNESCO, the Policies Commission argues, a point which will not be contested by any American, provided only that the instruction is given to pupils of an age to understand at least something of what it is all about.

So, the assumption is that UNESCO and those who initiate and carry on the teaching in the schools are wholly unbiased and tell the whole truth, while those persons who object to celebration of UN Day in the schools and other propaganda moves are demanding that pupils be indoctrinated with a viewpoint opposed to UNESCO and all that it stands for!

One of the "touchy" points of the propaganda for world super-government is the One Worlders' contention that steps must be taken to put into practice the theories of race equality. Let us see how objectively UNESCO treats this delicate matter, so close to the hearts of those Americans who believe that the Creator had a purpose in mind when he populated the earth with peoples of different colors and attributes.

"Text of the statement issued July 18, 1950," is incorporated in UNESCO Publication 791, titled *The Race Question*. On Page 8 we read:

The biological fact of race and the myth of "race" should be distinguished. For all practical social purposes "race" is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth. The myth "race" has created an enormous amount of human and social damage. In recent years it has taken a heavy toll in human lives and caused untold suffering. It still prevents the normal development of millions of human beings and deprives civilization of the effective co-operation of productive minds. The biological differences between ethnic groups should be disregarded from the standpoint of social acceptance and social action. The unity

of mankind from both the biological and social viewpoints is the main thing. To recognize this and to act accordingly is the first requirement of modern man.

This means only one thing: open advocacy of miscegnation and mongrelization. Now then, perhaps that is what we in America need; perhaps it is even what we want. But certainly we have in America a great number of people, possibly a minority, but still a large number, who are revolted by this propaganda. Certainly it is a controversial matter, and for NEA to pretend that UNESCO approaches the problem objectively is utterly ridiculous.

Seven final pages of the *NEA Handbook* are designated as Part V and devoted to such information as NEA editors desire to divulge about the World Organization of the Teaching Profession. The title page presents a short paragraph of laudation of the UN Declaration of Human Rights; the tribute is credited to *The Scottish Educational Journal*.

Primarily a federation of national organizations of teachers, WOTP also accepts individuals as associate members. The societies which are members of WOTP are nationals of *Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, *China, *Denmark, Ecuador, England, *Estonia, Finland, *France, *Germany, Iceland, India, *Indonesia, *Ireland, *Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, *Liberia, Luxemburg, Malta, New Zealand, Nigeria, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Scotland, *Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United States and Yugoslavia, 35 countries in all. Associates (individual members) number approximately 1,200, the majority of them residents of the United States.

WOTP appears to be growing, but not too stable.

In the *Handbook* of 1951-52, 27 countries appeared on the list of nations. In the list above, the asterisks preceding names of nations indicate that they did not appear on the list of the previous year. Missing from the later list are Burma and Egypt, and England, on the later alphabetical list, occupies the place of England and Wales.

The United States members of WOTP are American Federation of Teachers, 20,000 members; American Teachers Association, 13,614 members, and National Education Association.

At this writing it does not appear that WOTP is a particularly potent factor in the movement toward world super-government, though the desire is clear enough.

Desire of NEA leadership to continue on along the path to Socialism also is clear enough, and this leadership has the means as well as the will.

In carrying out its various projects, National Education Association lacks neither suitable agencies nor the funds with which to operate. Foundations have been kind to NEA and its commissions and other subsidiaries. *Annual Report* of the (Rockefeller) General Education Board for 1940 reveals gifts to various organizations of educators, and announces one in particular which seems worthy of attention:

"The one new undertaking in the area of instructional materials and methods for which funds were made available in 1940 was a project sponsored jointly by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Council for Social Studies (of the National Education Association) for the preparation of a series of 'resource units' in the social studies.

"In most secondary schools an important phase of civic education is the social studies program. In this

area many teachers suffer from a lack of advance preparation in the social sciences and from unfamiliarity with instructional materials.

"The most rapidly growing course in the secondary school curriculum is the course called Contemporary Social Problems, or Problems of Democracy, given in the eleventh or twelfth grades. Textbooks for this course have not proved very satisfactory and there is a real need for coöperation between social scientists and secondary school teachers in developing better instructional methods.

"Recognizing this need, the National Association of Secondary School Principals undertook an exploration of the problem with a group of social scientists at the University of Chicago in 1940. Out of the exploration grew a plan for the development of twelve or more units which would serve teachers as resource material (but not as textbooks for students) in helping pupils gain a clearer understanding of problems involved in such fields as planning and public finance, public education, population, unemployment, health, personal security and self-development, democracy and dictatorship, free enterprise and collectivism, American defense. . . . A grant of \$17,500 from the General Education Board will care for the expense involved in the preparation of materials."

Developing this project, the two departments of NEA put out a series of booklets on the general subject, "Problems of American Life." One of these was *The American Way of Business*, which purported to tell teachers of the high schools how American business enterprises are operated, so that the teachers, in turn, could properly advise the students.

Selected as authors of this booklet were two alien-born professors with pronounced pro-Soviet back-

grounds. One was Oscar Lange, then an economics professor of the University of Chicago; the other was Abba Lerner, a Bessarabian refugee whose alma mater is the London School of Economics, best known in America as the institution which for many years had Harold J. Laski as its most renowned professor.

In 1945, the year after publication of the Lange-Lerner book by the two NEA agencies, Lange renounced his American citizenship to become a citizen and official of Soviet Poland; he became the United Nations representative of the Polish puppet government. Lerner went on to teach at Roosevelt College, a left-wing institution in the Chicago loop.

More might be revealed about the backgrounds and other projects of the two authors, but our chief interest lies in the content of the booklet under consideration. The following three paragraphs are quoted verbatim from *Prejudice and the Press*, by Frank Hughes, Devin-Adair, 1950:

Here are some of the points that Lange and Lerner drilled into the minds of American teachers and their pupils under the guise of an "American Way of Business": "The idea of abolishing private enterprise came from socialist thinkers who believed that this change would actually further the development of the individual." That American business men "cannot at the same time claim credit for producing the things that are beneficial to society . . . their aim, when they go into business, is to make money and the good or the harm done to society is a secondary matter, even though there may be a temptation to claim credit when it does good and to evade responsibility when it does harm."

That "the concepts of accounting and sound

business that are proper for private enterprise . . . have no necessary relevance for public enterprise." That "public enterprise must become a major constituent of our economy, if we are really going to have economic prosperity." That "it is necessary to have public ownership of banking and credit (investment banks and insurance companies). . . . A publicly owned banking and credit system alone is compatible with the flexibility of capital value necessary to maintain competitive standards in production and trade." That "it is necessary to have public ownership of monopolistic key industries. . . . The legal basis for public ownership of such industries should be provided by an amendment of the anti-trust laws, providing that in cases of proved repetition of monopolistic practices and impossibility of correcting the situation on the basis of private enterprise, the companies in question should be transferred into public ownership and operated on the 'principle of public service.' "

That "it is necessary to have public ownership of basic natural resources (mines, oil fields, timber, coal, etc.)." That "in order to insure that the public corporations act in accordance with the competitive 'rules of the game,' special economic courts (enjoying the same independence as courts of justice) might be established. . . . That the economic courts be given the power to repeal any rules of Congress, of the legislatures, or of the municipal councils. . . ." (*American Way of Business*, by Oscar Lange and Abba Lerner, published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Council for the Social Studies divisions of the National Education Association, 1201 16th Str. N. W., Washington, D. C., 1944.)

Amazing? Surely, but hardly more than the "revelations" in earlier chapters of this little book; really, it is all of one pattern.

Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs of this chapter, or in other chapters of this little book, is intended as an attack upon either the public schools or the teaching profession as such: nor can anything in these writings reasonably be construed as such attack.

Actually this little book represents the results of a sincere effort to disclose a small section of the record of false leadership of the profession.

This present writer refuses to believe that the entire teaching profession, or even a majority of the teachers, has been infected with the subversive propaganda of collectivism.

Rather, this writer believes that when the teachers of the nation learn the real truth about the objectives of National Education Association as determined by the present leadership, the loyal American teachers will arise in holy wrath and "turn the rascals out," then reorganize along the lines of an *American* professional organization.

Time alone can tell what the teachers will do.

INDEX

A

Abortion, legalized, 126
 Abundant life (democracy), 104
 Academic Freedom, 13 (c), 13
 Acquired abstractions, 124
 Adams, John, 86
 Adult education, 8
 Adult Education, Department of, 161
 Affiliated Associations (NEA), 157f
 Alien and Sedition Laws, 100
 Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 79
 America called a democracy, 39, 54, 78, 99, 106, 166
 America equated with European nations, 99f
 America First Foundation, 86
 American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 161
 American Association of School Administrators, 9 (footnote), 16, 18, 20, 97, 122f, 162, 171f
 American Bar Association, 142, 158
American Citizens Handbook, The, 49ff, 61, 142ff
 American Civil Liberties Union, 18
 American concept of government, 102ff
 American Coordinating Committee for International Studies, 47
 American Council on Education, 14
 American Dream, 37
 American Educational Research Association, 162
 American Education Fellowship, 12
 American Federation of Teachers, 178
 American Historical Association, 33, 136
 American history, teaching of,

97f, 133

American Industrial Arts Association, 162
 American League Against War and Fascism, 18
 American League for Peace and Democracy, 18
 American Legion, 86
 American Medical Association, 158, 161
American Program of Plenty, An, Chase, 56f
 American Teachers Association, 178
 American Tradition, study of, 97ff
 American Vigilant Intelligence Committee, 86
 "American Way" criticized, 21ff, 32, 37f, 53f, 68ff, 76f, 97ff, 101
American Way of Business, The, 179ff
 American Youth Congress, 27, 69
 Americana Corporation, 81
Americans All: Studies in Inter-cultural Education, 42f
 Anarchy, 134
 Ancestor-worshippers, 86
Anti-Duhring, Engels, 128
Appendix IX, 69, 141
 Armistice Day, 89
 Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 137, 162
 Atlantic Charter, 106ff
 Audio-Visual Instruction, Department of, 162
 Austin, Warren Robinson, 137
 "Authority" rejected, 59f
 Ayres, Leonard, 92

B

Baldwin, Roger, 18
 Bardolph, Richard, 37
 Barnes, Harry Elmer, 124f
 Beale, Howard K., 20, 85f

- Betsy Ross, 172
 Better America Federation, 86
 Beveridge, Sir William, 141
 Bible reading in schools, 118ff
 Bicknell, Thomas W., 7
 Biddle, William W., 90f
Bill of Grievances, A, 63
 Bill of Rights, 86, 100, 103, 111
 Bill of Rights ineffective, 77
 Birch, Hugh Taylor, 51
 Black Legion, 77
 Blacklisting of textbooks, 105
 Board of Directors (NEA), 158
 Board of Trustees (NEA), 158
 Bolshevik revolution, 36
 Book Review Digest, 168
 Boulder Dam, 67
 Bourgeoisie political ideas, 37
 Boy Scouts, 26
 Brameld, Theodore, 11ff, 15
Brass Tacks, Coyle, 58
 British Colonies, 103
 British concept of state, 101ff
 British under Socialism, 102, 108f
 Brotherhood, 121, 146
 Browder, Earl, 18, 113
 Bruner survey, 133
Byrn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin, 41f
Building America called unfit, 70
 C
 Cameron, W. J., 83ff
 California Appellate Court, 142
 California State Teachers Association, 10
 Cantril, Hadley, 83ff
 Capitalism, 108
 Capitalist system breakdown, 46
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 132
 Carr, William G., 9 (footnote), 121f
 Cartoons, historical, 75
 Centennial Action Program, 157
 Change, 8, 24, 92
 Changing economy, 24
 Chase, Stuart, 18, 92, 167f
 Chattel slavery, 100
 Chauvinism, 86
 Chicago Teachers College, 43
 Child-centered education, 90
 Childs, John L., 24
 Christian Century, 93
 Christian education, 62, 124
 Christian faith, 110f, 126
 Christianity, 104, 117, 126, 174f
 Christian missionaries, 174
 Christian training, 124
Citizens for a New World, 131f
 Citizenship, Committee on, 161
 Citizenship Courses, 173
 Civilian Conservation Corps, 68
 Civil liberties, 77, 100f, 142f
 Civil rights, 100f
 Civil Rights — Significance and Repression, study course, 100f
 Civil War, 146
 Classical economists, 13
 Classroom Teachers, Department of, 162
 Class struggle, 35, 125
 Class system, 17, 26, 32, 35f
 Clergymen, number in U. S., 158
 Clinchy, Everett R., 55
 Clothing unit of *Building America*, 80
 Collective planning, 24
 Collectivism and democracy equated, 111ff
 Collectivism inevitable, 33ff, 57
 Collectivism on world scale, 140
 "Collectivist plot . . .," Kaub, 140f
 College of Education, U. of Minn., 11
 Columbia University, 10, 26, 92, 95, 132
 Columbia University Press, 65
 Combs, R. E., 71ff
 "Coming Victory of Democracy," lecture and book, Mann, 112
 Comintern, 81
 Commager, Henry Steele, 110f
 Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, 156
 Commission on Youth Problems, 26
 Commissions (NEA), 158f, 161
 Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, 132
 Committee on Economic Goals, 10
 Committee on the Social Studies, 33f
 Committees (NEA), 158f, 161
Common Sense, Paine, 147
 Communism, 13, 20, 99

- Communism and Socialism, 12, 20
 Communism and World Government, 140ff
 Communism best antidote for fascism, 43ff
 Communism lauded, 13, 20
 Communist fronts, 141
 Communist International, 114
 Communist leaflets 92
Communist Manifesto, 128
 Communist Party, 18, 27, 113f
 Communist-Socialist movement, 140
 Community of nations, 132
 Competition seen as evil, 14, 164f
 Compulsory flag exercises, 20
 Compulsory flag salutes, 88f
 Compulsory teaching, 20
 Conditioning will of the people, 137f
 Confucius, 51
 Constitution criticized, 22, 32, 76, 79, 84f, 134f
 Constitution (Federal), 88f, 117ff, 131
 Constitution "sidetracking" advocated, 135
 Constitutional amendments, 78, 135
 Constitutional Convention, 79
 Constitutional delegation of powers, 103
 Constitutional limitation of powers, 103
 Constitutions (state), 88f, 118f
Consumer Cooperation, McLanahan, 54
 Contemporary Social Problems (study course), 179
 Cooperation, 8, 14, 54ff, 57
 Cooperation, training youth for, 34
 Cooperative League of America, 54
 Correlation of economic and race problems, 55
 Coughlin, Father, 92
 Council on Foreign Relations, 46
 Counts, George S., 165
 Cowles brothers, 12
 Coyel, David Cushman, 57ff
 Credit Unions, Committee on, 161
 Criticism of "American Way," 22ff, 32, 37f, 53f, 68, 71ff, 76f, 97ff, 101
 Criticism of Constitution, 22, 76, 79, 84f, 134f
 Crusade against religion, 61
 Curriculum requirements, 88ff, 149f
 Cyclic Club, 156

D

Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? Counts, 165
 Daughters of American Revolution, 32
 Dean, Vera Micheles, 40f
 Declaration of Independence, 86, 100, 111, 130, 175
 Democracy, 38f, 54, 59f
 Democracy and collectivism equated, 111ff
 Democracy and Communism equated, 113ff
 Democracy and Its Competitors, study course, 98ff
 Democracy, a way of life, 104
 Democracy defined, 58f
 Democracy (Grecian), 106f
 Democracy of co-ops, 54f
 Democracy, preoccupation with, 60, Chapter VI
 Democracy, Russian style, 39, 43
 Democracy, sole alternative to totalitarianism, 99
 Democracy theme, 104
 Democratic "faith," Dewey's, 59f
 Democratic society, 143
 Democratic thought, 12
 Democratic way called best for America, 106f
 Department of Superintendence, 7ff, 10, 16, 17, 24, 33, 38, 104
 Department of Supervisors and Curriculum Development, 65
 Department of Supervision and Directors of Instruction, 43, 64f
 Departments (NEA), 158f, 161f
 Depressions related to race problems, 55
Design for America, Brameld, 12
Desirable Social Economic Goals of America, 10, 165
 Devil, 75

- Dewey, John, 10, 14, 53, 59, 95,
 125, 146ff, 165
 Divisions (NEA), 163
Documents of American History,
 Commager, 110f
 Domestic science, John Dewey
 view, 150f
 Douglas, Paul H., 93
Dreams, Hughes, 50f
 E
 Economic courts, 181
 Economic democracy, 17
 Economic determinism, 128, 130
 Economic nationalism, 45ff
Economic Systems in the U. S.,
 Coyle, 57
Economy of Abundance, The,
 Chase, 18, 56f
 Economic of plenty, 8
 Economy of scarcity, 23
 Editorial content of textbooks, 66
Education and Human Relations,
 Clinchy, 55
Education and the Social Crisis,
 Kilpatrick, 14
Education Against Propaganda,
 83ff
 Education as "force," 137ff
 Education defined by Dewey, 152
Education for Family Life, 122f
 "Education for International Af-
 fairs," Dean, Vera Micheles,
 40f
*Education for International Un-
 derstanding in American
 Schools*, 136f
Educational Frontier, The, 14
 Educational goal, John Dewey
 view, 152ff
 Educational Policies Commission,
 97, 117ff, 161, 175f
 Edwards, Harry Stillwell, 60
 Eichelberger, Clark M., 132
 Electricity a public utility, 67
 Elementary School Principals,
 Department of, 162
 Ellis, Elmer, 83ff, 90
 Emotions, use of in indoctrina-
 tion, 139f
 Engels, Frederick, 114, 128
 E. P. I. C., 92
 Establishment of religion, 117
 Ethnic groups, 176
 Examination of textbooks, 20
 F
 Family institutions, 127
 Family life, 12, 122ff
 Farmers' organization, 92
 Farm Security Administration, 71
 Fascism, 18, 20, 29, 43, 46, 92, 99
 Fascism, greatest danger, 43
 Fear technique, 23f
 Federal Aid to Education, 169ff
 Federal agencies, 171
 Federal control, 170f
 Federal Employment Service, 68
 Federal inspection, 171
 Federal Writers' Project, 63
 Fees, membership in NEA, 159
 Feudalism basis of American so-
 ciety, 22f
 Fieldston School, 97
 Filene, Edward A., 93
 First Amendment, 117ff, 143
 First Inaugural (Jefferson), 86
 Five Year Plan, 42
 Fletcher School of Law and Di-
 plomacy, 47
 Floodwood experiment, 11ff
 Food unit of *Building America*,
 63ff
 Force in "education," 137ff
 Ford Sunday Evening Hour, 83ff
*Foundation of Modern World
 Society*, Mander, 46
 Founders besmirched, 79
 Founders feared strong govern-
 ment, 103
 Four-H Clubs, 26f
 Franklin, Benjamin, 86f
 Freedom of religion, 111, 118,
 143
 Freedom of speech denied, 77
 Freedom from fear, 164
 Full employment, 12
 Fundamental change, 92
 Future Farmers, 26
 G
 Garnett, A. Campbell, 61
 General welfare, 143
 General Education Board (Rock-
 efeller), 178f
 Gettysburg address, 146
 Girl Scouts, 26

Given, Willard E., 7, 9ff
 Goal of Education, John Dewey view, 152ff
 Goals for America, 10f, 165
 Gold Clause Act, 78
 Golden Rule, 146
Golden Treasury for the Citizen, A, 50ff
 Goslin, Willard, 15f
 Government defined by Washington, 103
 Government Ownership (see also public ownership), 9
 Government responsibility, 12f
 Grading of students, John Dewey's view, 148
 Gradualism, 23, 57, 67
 Graduate School, University of Minnesota, 11
 Grand Army of the Republic, 86
 Greek democracy, 106f
 Group-sanctioned patterns, 122
 Guilds, 108

H

Harper Prize Essay, 57
 Hate and economics, 55f
 Haymarket Riot, 77
 Headquarters divisions (NEA), 153f
 Headquarters (NEA), 159
 Hebraic uxoriousness, 127
 Herndon, Angelo, 100
 Higher Education, Department of, 162
 Hindustani, proverbs of, 51
 Historical cartoons, 75
History of Western Civilization, The, Barnes, 127f
 History, John Dewey view, 150
 History, teaching of, 30ff, 97ff, 133
 Homestead strike, 80
 Hoover, Herbert, 92
 House Committee on Un-American Activities, 18, 27, 69, 141
 Housing recommendations, 80
 Housing, unit of *Building America*, 63ff
 Hughes, Frank, 180
 Hughes, Langston, 51
 Hulburd, David, 13
 Human nature, 125

Humphrey, Hubert H., 13
 Hunt, Erling M., 132

I

Ilma, Viola, 69
 Illinois State Teachers Association, 10
 Images, importance in education, 153
 Imperialism, 86
Improvement of Education, The, 17ff
Improving the Teaching of World History, 123f
 Indiana State Teachers College, 164
 Indiana University, 10
 Indoctrination, 138ff
 Industrial revolution, 36, 125, 128f
 Inevitability of collectivism, 33ff, 57
 Inflationism, 92
 International Council for Exceptional Children, 162
 International Court of Justice, 144
 International (also Universal) Declaration of Human Rights, 141f
 International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 79
 International law, 134, 143
 International police force, 132
 International Relations, Committee on, 161
 International Relations, studies in, Chapter VIII, 131ff
 International Studies Conference, 47
 Institute for Propaganda Analysis, 92ff
 Institutional patterns, 122
 Intimidation of teachers, 20
Is Communism a Menace?, Browder-Sokolosky debate, 113
 Isolationism, 86

J

Jackson, Andrew, 114
 James, British king, 110f
 Jefferson, Thomas, 75, 86f, 114
 Jefferson's First Inaugural, 86
 Jesus Christ, 174
 Jesus Christ, second coming, 62

- Johns Hopkins University, 10
Journal of the NEA, 11f, 52, 61,
 146, 159, 163, 174ff, 173f
 Judeo-Christian faith, 115
 Junior Grange, 26
 K
 Kallett, Arthur, 18
 Kantian rationalization, 127
 Kelly, Fred J., 10
 Key Men of America, 86
 Keynes, John Maynard, 92
 Kilpatrick, William Heard, 14f,
 125
 Kingdom of God, 154
 King James, 110f
 Know Nothing Party, 100
 Kohler, Walter J., 108f
 Ku Klux Klan, 100
 L
 Labor movement, 19
 Labor organizations, 92
 Laissez faire, 8, 32f, 37, 47f
 Lamont, Corliss, 42
 Lange, Oscar, 180
 Laski, Harold J., 180
 League of Nations, 49, 131
*Learning the Ways of Democ-
 racy*, 96f
 Legalized abortion, 126
 "Legends" of history, 29f
 Legislative — Federal Relations,
 Division of, 163
 Legislative Policy Statement, 169f
 Lenin, 114
 Lerner, Abba, 180
 Libertarian "stream," 12
 Liberty League, 92
 Life membership (NEA), 159
 Limitations of freedom, 142ff
 Lincoln, Abraham, 86f, 114, 146
 Lincoln School, 26
 Lindeman, Edward C., 93f
 Lindsey, Margaret, 164
 Literature, John Dewey view, 150
 Locke, John, 21
 London School of Economics, 180
 Lovejoy, Elijah, 77
 Loyalty oath laws, 88f
 Lumley, Frederick E., 94
 Lustron fiasco, 81
 M
 Machines enslave men, 52f
 Madison, James, 86f
 Magna Charta, 100
 Mander, Linden A., 45
 Mann, Horace, 52, 147
 Mann, Thomas, 112
 Manual training, John Dewey
 view, 150ff
 Marriage, sacramental view, 127
 Marshall, Leon C., 10
 Marx, Karl, 57, 60, 92, 114f, 117,
 128
 Marxian theories, 40, 56, 117, 125,
 128
 "Master" class, 18
 Materialist conception of history,
 128
 Mather, Kirtley, 94
 Mayflower Compact, 106f, 110
 McLanahan, C. J., 53
 Membership fees, NEA, 159
 Membership, NEA and affiliates,
 157f
 Memorial Day, 89
 Middle class, 125
 Military training in schools, 20
 Miller, Clyde R., 92ff
Milwaukee Journal, The, 108
 Milwaukee State Teachers Col-
 lege, 90
 Minneapolis newspapers, 12
*Minority Problems in the Public
 Schools*, 13
 Miscegnation, 177
 Mississippi Valley Committee, 67
Missouri v. Holland, court case,
 142
 Mixed economy, 47f, 57
 Moderate Socialism, 19
 Modification of established order,
 9
 Mohammed, sayings of, 50
 Mongrelization, 177
 Monopolistic industries, 181
 Montagu, M. F. Ashley, 123
 Monetary theories, 92
 Montesquieu, 22
 Moore, Robert C., 10
*Moral and Spiritual Values in
 the Public Schools*, 117ff
 Morgan, Joy Elmer, 52, 54, 146f,
 155, 165ff, 173ff
 Murray-Kilgore Bill, 141

- Music Educators National Conference, 162
- My Pedagogic Creed*, Dewey, 59 146ff
- Myth of race, 176f
- Myths of history, 30f
- N
- Nation, The*, 167
- National Association of Deans of Women, 162
- National Association of Secondary School Principals, 162, 179
- National Civic Federation, 86
- National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, 14, 161
- National Commission on Safety Education, 160
- National Commission on Teachers, Education and Professional Standards, 161
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, The, 162
- National Council on Teacher Retirement, 161
- National Conference of Christians and Jews, 55
- National Council for American Education, 12f, 15
- National Council for the Social Studies, 20, 30, 34ff, 83, 93, 105f, 123f, 131, 133, 135, 162, 178f
- National Council of Education, 7, 11
- National Council of Teachers of English, 43
- National Resources Board, 67
- National School Public Relations Association, 162f
- National Science Teachers Association, 163
- National Security League, 86
- National Student Federation, 69
- National Youth Administration, 26f, 68
- Natural biological behavior, 122
- Natural resources, 181
- Natural Resources Committee, 74
- NEA and American Medical Association, joint committee, 161
- NEA Handbook*, 159f, 177f
- NEA History*, 9f
- NEA lobbyists, 158
- NEA Committee on Economic Goals, 10
- NEA Platform, 169f
- Nazism, 99
- Neilson, William Allen, 132
- New Deal, 78, 92
- New Deal lauded, 78
- New Republic*, 167
- New Masses*, 113
- New Testament* teachings, 104, 175
- New York Times*, 78, 112, 135, 168
- Newlon, Jesse H., 26
- New York School of Social Research, 93
- Norris, George W., 67
- O
- Ohio State University, 94
- Old Glory, 173
- Olson, Willard C., 164f
- "Our Constitution", unit of *Building America*, 75ff
- Overproduction, 92
- Overstreet, Harry A., 53f
- P
- Pacifism, 20
- Pacifistic teachers, 20
- Paine, Thomas, 86, 114, 147
- Parliament, British, 102
- Patristic views, 127
- Paul Revere, 86
- Pearl Harbor, 93
- Peik, W. E., 11ff
- Penner, Mildred Pennison, 9
- Pepper, Claude, 168
- Personal Growth Leaflets, 51ff, 146, 163
- Petition of Rights, 100
- Philosophic Approach to Communism*, A, Brameld, 13
- Placement and advancement, 11
- Planning, national, 8f, 12, 21f, 25, 46ff, 80
- Plato, 123
- Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, 173
- Plymouth colonists, 110f
- Policy statement, 169f
- Power unit of *Building America*, 67f

- Prejudice and the Press*, Hughes, 180f
 Preoccupation with Democracy, 60; as chapter subject, 96
 Presidential power, 134
 Press and Radio Relations, Division of, 163
 Pressures on teachers, 88
 Preventive medicine, 126
Primer of Taxation, A, Coyle, 57
 Prior, Earle, 52
 Private ownership, 8
 Private property, 22, 122
 Problems of American Life (booklet series), 179f
 Problems of Democracy, (study course), 179
 Production for use, 57
 Professional Ethics, Committee on, 161
 Profit motive, 14
 Progressive education, 9, 149ff, 156
 Progressive Party, 167
 Promotions in school, John Dewey view, 148
 Propaganda, 101, Chapter V
 "Propaganda and the Radio", Cantril, 83
Propaganda Menace, The, 94 (footnote)
 Property Rights, 100f, 120
 Property rights and human rights, 37f, 123
 Protestantism, 125f
Publications List, 160ff
 Public corporations, 181
 Public Opinion, study course, 100
 Public Ownership, 181
 Public Ownership League, 67
Public Service Magazine, 140
 Q
 Queen Victoria, 102
 R
 Race, myth of, 176f
Race Question, The, 176f
 Rationalization, 127
Realistic Philosophy of Religion, Garnett, 61
 Recreation unit of *Building America*, 68
 Redistribution of wealth, 113
 Regional Power Districts, 67
 Reid, Patti, 172
 Religion, crusade against, 61
 Religion derided, 22
 Religion in schools, 117ff
 Religious pageantry, 121f
 Representative Assembly (NEA), 158, 160
 Republic, 87, 96, 98ff, 115f
Republic, The, Plato, 123
 Research Bulletin, Division of, 163
 Research Bulletins (NEA), 159
 Research, Division of, 163
 Reserve Officers Association, 86
 Revision of history, 31f
 Revolutionary Socialism, 20, 23f 35f
 Revolutionary War, 101
Roads to American Prosperity, Coyle, 57ff
 Rockefeller, General Education Board, 178f
 Roman Empire, 146
 Roosevelt College, 180
 Roosevelt (Franklin), president, 8
 Ross, Edward A., 10
 Rural Education, Department of, 163
 Rural Electrification Administration, 67
 Russia, "evolving," 39
 "Russia," unit of *Building America*, 81f
 S
 Sacred Writings, 50f
 Sacramental view of marriage, 127
 Sales tax, 170f
 Sanctions, 120
 Sanctity of the person, 122
 Saturday Review of Literature, 167
 School, John Dewey's conception of, 148f
 Science teaching, John Dewey view, 148f
Scottish Educational Journal, The, 177
 Secular religion, 126
 "Seeing America," unit of *Building America*, 71

- Seldes, George, 18
 - Selections for Memorizing, 50f
 - Self Motivation, 90
 - Senate Investigation Committee on Education, 70
 - Senatorial treaty powers, 134f
 - Sermon on the Mount, 60
 - Seven Adventures*, Overstreet, 53f
 - Sex Mores, 127
 - Share-the-Wealth, 92
 - Shotwell, James T., 132
 - Sixty Million Jobs, Wallace, 166f
 - Social Change, 21f, 31f
 - Social Change and Education*, 24
 - Social control, 8
 - Social credit, 92
 - Social democracy, 24
 - Social Education*, 37, 40f, 105, 132, 136
 - Socialism, 19f
 - Socialism and collectivism, 139f
 - Socialism and Communism, 12, 20
 - Socialism in Britain, 108f
 - Socialism, moderate, 19
 - Socialism, moral impulse, 112
 - Socialist regimes, 20
 - Socialist Party, 18
 - Socialistic ideals, John Dewey view, 153f
 - Socialized conduct, 122
 - Social trends, 129f
 - Social Studies Curriculum, The*, 33ff, 104f
 - Social transformation, 125
 - Society for Curriculum Study, The, 43, 63ff, 70, 82
 - Sokolosky, George E., 113
 - Sons of the American Revolution, National Society, 63, 86
 - Sons of Veterans, 86
 - Soule, George, 92
 - Sovereignty, surrender of, 133f
 - "Soviet Aggression; Myth or Reality," Lamont, 42
 - Soviets as pattern for America, 42
 - Soviets lauded or apologized for, 20, 23f, 30, 39, 41f, 42, 68, 81f
 - Soviets "related" to America, 30
 - Specialization of labor, 125
 - Speech Association of America, 163
 - Stalin, 114
 - Stanford University Press, 46
 - State constitutions, 88, 118f
 - State Department, 135
 - State intervention necessary, 125, 128
 - State level affiliates (NEA), 157
 - State religion, 118
 - State v. Scheve* (Nebraska case), 118f
 - Steel unit of *Building America*, 80f
 - Student Strike Against War, 69
 - Study and Teaching of American History, The*, 30, 106
 - Subject matter of curriculum, John Dewey's view, 148ff, 84, 91, 118f, 142
 - Supernationalism, 86, 126
 - Supreme Court decisions, 76, 78, 84, 91, 118f, 142
 - Survey, The*, 93
 - Sweden's iron ore, 109
- T
- Taft, Robert A., 168
 - Task Before Us, The*, Dewey, 59ff
 - Tax Education and School Finance, Committee on, 161
 - Taxes as savings, 59
 - Teacher as social reformer, 26, 154f
 - Teachers College (Columbia University), 26, 125
 - Teacher's responsibility in Dewey view, 148ff
 - Teaching Critical Thinking in the Social Studies, 93
 - Technocracy, 92
 - Ten Commandments, 38, 60, 104, 120, 122f
 - Tennessee Valley Authority, 67f, 78
 - Tenth Amendment, 103
 - Tenth Generation, The*, Edwards, 60f
 - Thayer, V. T., 14
 - Theodore Roosevelt High School, 98ff
 - Third International, 81

- This Happened in Pasadena*, Hulburd, 15
 Thomas, Norman, 18, 77, 92
 Thompson, Carl D., 18, 67
 Thucydides, 7
Time, 93
 Totalitarian government, 25
 Transition period, 8
 Treaty clause in Constitution derided, 134f
 Treaty of Versailles, 135
 "Treaty veto," 135
True Faith and Allegiance, 156
 Tugwell Bill, 65f
Twilight of Christianity, Barnes, 126
- U
- Uncle Remus Day, 88
Uncommon Sense, Coyle, 56
 Underconsumption, 92
 Unemployment insurance, 92
 Unemployment problems, 91
 Unesco, 50, 136, 173, 175ff
 Unified dues plan, 157
 Union Now, 38
 United Business Education Association, 163
 United Daughters of the Confederacy, 86
 United Nations, 50, 132, 136ff, 141, 143ff, 171f
 United Nations Charter, 50, 144
 United Nations Day, 172
 United Nations Education Service, 172
 United Nations Flag, 172f
United Nations, Unesco, and American Schools, The, 175f
 United States as a World Power, The, study unit, 133
 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 50, 141ff, 177
 Universal Military Training, 168
 University of Chicago, 12, 180
 University of Michigan, 165
 University of Minnesota, 11, 13, 35, 123
 University of Minnesota High School, 123
- University of Missouri, 83
 University of New York, 11, 49, 110
 University of North Carolina, 37, 85
 University of Washington, 45
 University of Wisconsin, 10
 U. S. Office of Education, 10, 171
 Utopia, 123, 155, 169, 173
 Venereal disease, 126
 Veterans of Foreign Wars, 86
 Victoria, Queen, 102
 Virginity, 127
Volume of Addresses and Proceedings, The, 159
- W
- War propaganda, 93f
 Washington, George, 31, 103
 Wattenberg, William W., 43
 West, Edith, 35
Who's Who in America, 124
 Wheels within wheels, 7, 16
 Wilson, Woodrow, 50
 Working Class oppressed, 35f
 Works Progress Administration, 63, 68
World Almanac, 158 (footnote)
 World collectivism, 140ff
World Economy in Transition, Staley, 47
 World government, 132ff, 140ff, 144
 World-minded American, 138f
 World Organization of the Teaching Profession, 177f
 World War and civil rights, 100
 World War III, 135
- X Y Z
- Yearbook of American Churches*, 158 (footnote)
 Young Communists, 27, 69
 Young Pioneers, 82
Your Life in the Making, Morgan, 54
Youth Education Today, 26
 "Youth Faces the World," unit of *Building America*, 68f
 Youth initiative, 27
 Youth problems, 68



University of
Connecticut
Libraries
